

The

American Historical Review

ALTOPASCIO—A FORGOTTEN ORDER

MARSIGLIO of Padua in his *Defensor Pacis*, written about the year 1324, speaking of the efforts made by the Roman Curia to include as many classes of persons as possible under the term "clergy", says: "Sic quoque fratres templariorum, hospitaliorum et reliquos plures hujusmodi ordines, similiter et eos qui de alto-passu."

Who were these *qui de alto passu*? Marsiglio makes no further mention of them, and there is no reason to suppose that they were of any special importance for the understanding of his argument. Obviously they served him only as one more illustration of the practice he was condemning, of investing lay brethren with the clerical character. The words, however, piqued my curiosity, and, having once found a clue to their meaning, I was led to follow it up from one step to another until a considerable fund of information, misinformation, and conjecture was gathered, which may have some interest for other inquirers.

As I said over to myself the words *alto passu* I could not help being reminded of Altopascio, a little Tuscan hill town between Florence and Lucca, where Castruccio Castracani had given the Florentine army a notable beating in 1325. The connection of ideas seemed, however, so purely fanciful that I believed the trail to be a false one. Nor was any help forthcoming from works of general reference. The word "Altopascio" does not occur in the index to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, nor in that of the *Kirchen-Lexicon* or of Herzog-Plitt. The *Encyclopedia* gives it in its French form in a casual reference under "Indulgence". Each of these publications has a brief notice of the so-called *fratres pontifices*, but nothing that points definitely toward an explanation of *de alto passu*.

The clue was given me by a philological colleague through a chance reference in an unimportant manual of medieval church history trans-

lated from the French.¹ "The Friars of Haut-Pas were occupied in building bridges and in helping travellers. Coming from Lucques [sic] . . . they spread thence into different countries. At Paris they founded the hospital of St. Jacques of Haut-Pas." It was easy to trace this brief reference to Helyot, *Histoire des Ordres Religieux et Militaires*, second edition (1792), II. 282. Helyot calls these brethren "Chanoines Hospitaliers de S. Jacques du Haut-Pas ou de Lucques". Heimbucher, in his exhaustive *Orden und Kongregationen der Katholischen Kirche* (1907-1908, II. 258), gives a few lines, obviously taken from Helyot, to the Order, calling them Hospitallers of St. James, and assigning to them a house near Lucca, *S. Giacomo dell' alto passo*. Helyot in his turn quotes from Du Breul, *Le Théâtre des Antiquitez de Paris* (1612), p. 576, who gives a description of the "Hospital of St. Jacques du Hault-Pas in Paris". This hospital, he says, was founded by King Philip the Fair, whose reign began in 1286.

It was called *du Hault-pas*, not because of the altitude of the land (*assiette du lieu*), nor because it had to be reached by steps, but because it was a dependent member of the Great Hospital of St. James *du Hault-pas* in the diocese of Lucca in Italy, which maintains a landing-place (*port*) and a ferry on the river Argues le Blanc in the territory of Florence and on the high road to Rome, where formerly a heavy tribute was exacted. This road has now been made free by members of the aforesaid Great Hospital and of other hospitals affiliated with it. So that at present all pilgrims and others freely pass there without payment.

Du Breul speaks of *chevaliers* and of a *Commandeur General* of the Paris hospital, as if the members constituted a military order; but Helyot thought this was an error because "no writer on the military orders mentions them". He also says that the river "Argues le Blanc" is doubtless the Arno, because there is no river Argues. Certainly, after some study of old maps and descriptions of the region I have been unable to find any river name that suggests an explanation of this apparent blunder of the Parisian antiquary. There is little doubt that he referred to the Arno. I had laid aside further inquiry for lack of a definite trail when, thanks to the admirable system of "contents analysis" in the Harvard College library, I stumbled upon a work which otherwise would have been completely buried in a collection called *Curiosità Letterarie* (vol. LIV., 1864). This was the *Regola dei Frati di S. Jacopo d'Altopascio*, and the careful cataloguer had added in pencil "or *Tepascio*". The editor, Pietro Fanfani, in a short preface, states his obligations to an earlier

¹ André Lagarde, *The Latin Church in the Middle Ages* (1915).

scholar, Giovanni Lami, doctor of laws, public professor of ecclesiastical history in the University of Florence, prefect of the Riccardi Library, etc., whose curious hodge-podge of antiquarian lore, *Deliciae Eruditorum*, was published at Florence in the eighteenth century. The volumes which interest us appeared at intervals from 1741 to 1754. Lami was a man of great learning with a sound instinct for documentary material, but subject to the eighteenth-century taste for picturesquely distorted narrative. To disguise the dreariness of a systematic collection of documents he tells his story under the form of a sort of diary of a journey down the Arno valley, with the cumbersome title: *Charitonis et Hippophili Hodocporicon*. Chariton is himself, and Hippophilus is his "learned companion", Philip Elmius. Fortunately the choice humor of this introduction is not carried out too far, and Lami's real interest appears in his contribution of documents giving valuable glimpses of economic and social conditions in the places he visited.

In his preface addressed to the "candid reader" he explains that his aim is, not so much to offer commentaries of his own, as to present a selection of ancient treatises, of documents and unpublished material on Tuscan history. To this end he proposes to follow the course of his journey and to bring in *antiquas lucubrationes et vetera instrumenta* by which that history may be enriched. He takes an assumed name to avoid the appearance of seeking to advertise his own by constant repetition.

On the seventh of September, 1740, the travellers set out from Florence by carriage "in the direction of Pisa". As they jog along the writer calls attention to one place after another on the right hand or the left and branches out into little dissertations on the origin of religious houses, the documentary treasures they contain, the famous men of letters they have produced, and so on. Sometimes, as at San Miniato, he gives us a continuous summary of the chronicles of the place in chronological order.

A specimen of the kind of personal encounter which our editor thought worthy of record is the following:

As Chariton approached Monte Lupo he met Padre Maestro Tommaso Maria Moniglia and his companion Father Giustiniani Sciotto, Dominicans of the Congregation of San Marco at Florence, returning from their monastery of San Miniato, where they had been defending certain theological propositions. . . .

So, stopping their carriages, they conversed together, and Father Moniglia said that he had seen at San Miniato and again at San Romano, a monastery of the Minorite Observants, Father Giovanni Antonio of Santa Croce, who was on his way back from Spain, where he had been

attending as Commissary General the General Chapter of his Order of Minorites at Valladolid.

Father Moniglia said also that at San Miniato he had spoken with Doctor Leopoldo Guadagni, professor of civil law at the University of Pisa, who is accustomed to spend his vacations in that city [San Miniato], where he has a brother, rector of the Seminary. Sig. Guadagni is a Florentine, a very learned man and a fellow-student of Chariton in the study of Greek under the famous Abbot Anton Maria Salvini. He has recently published in the *Collection of Scientific Papers* at Venice a very learned treatise on the *Leggi Censorie*.

So the amiable recorder goes on page after page, jotting down whatever he thinks would come under the head of "delights for the learned". References to Altaspasio begin when the traveller reaches San Miniato, where he quotes from the local chronicle the very brief mention of the famous victory of 1325. They continue whenever the brethren of the Hospital of St. James are mentioned in land grants or other documents until Fucecchio is reached. There begins a chronological survey of documents pertaining to that place from 950 to 1239. At this point it occurs to Chariton that it would be well here to discourse about the neighboring town of Altaspasio, and so following his usual method, he begins with a document of the year 746. This is a conveyance of land by the honorable gentleman Causulus of Lucca to a presbyter, Tanuald of St. Regulus, in the third year of the Lombard king Rachis. The land was a property "in Teutpascu, qui vocatur Tersuarius". The document is given by Muratori² only as a text for his dissertation on the Italian dialects and as an especially clear illustration of the great corruption of the Latin of the eighth century. To draw any conclusion from its verbal forms would be risky in the extreme, but it serves our eighteenth-century philologist as a starting-point for his discourse about Altaspasio.

"This word", says Lami, "was formed at a later time by prefixing an article or a preposition to the earlier and simple name, *Teupascio* or *Teutpascu*." He thinks the word is Etruscan and, "since the Etruscan language was very similar to the Latin", he concludes that the name was equivalent to *totus pascuus*, "as in fact at the present day it is a land of meadows and streams and fresh plants and grasses". Further, Lami supposed that the original name came directly from a river *Teupascio*, which he finds mentioned in a grant of 1056, some three hundred years later than the supposed origin of the town. But, after all, he adds that he cares very little for etymology and is concerned only to show that the place is very old, dating back to a time before Charlemagne.

² *Antiquitates Italicae Medii Aevi*, II. 1041 (1739).

I venture to suggest that the derivation here is neither from "Etruscan" nor from Latin, but from German. Our earliest document reminds us by its very dating that it belongs in the Lombard days and country. It is from the third year of the Lombard king Rachis. *Teutpascu* may well have meant "German pasture" or, by a very slight modification, "German pass". Among the witnesses to the deed are a Ratpert, a Tuirerpert, and an Eliprandus, and the scribe is Aldipertus, all obviously German names. The next earliest document known to Lami is a deed of land in which one of the parties is a Teutio, and a reference is made to a priest Theupert. The date is 1056. In the neighborhood, near the junction of Arno and Elsa, is the castle of San Miniato al Tedesco. In short, the whole region was deeply penetrated by German elements. It was a part of the Lombard duchy of Tuscany, which had been an administrative unit from the time of the earliest Lombard occupation.

This etymological discussion would be trifling if it were not complicated by another resemblance which I am inclined to regard as equally accidental. Instead of *Teupascio* we sometimes find *Taufascio* or *Topascio*, and this has been explained by the resemblance of the symbol which appears upon all monuments and upon the dress of the members of the Order to the Greek letter *Tau*. Of this we shall have occasion to speak later.

The Hospital, or perhaps better the Hospice, of St. James of Altopascio, stood upon an ancient road leading from Tuscany to Rome and later known as the *Via Francesca*, because it was the most frequented road for pilgrims and others coming from France. The neighboring region was covered with forests, the ancient lair of dangerous beasts and still more savage men. The primary object of the hospice seems, therefore, to have been as a refuge for travellers, especially for pilgrims to Rome. The earliest reference to it is in a bull of Innocent III. in 1198, the first year of his papacy, confirming gifts made by bishops of Lucca, whose names point to the third quarter of the eleventh century. The house must, then, have existed no inconsiderable time before that date.

Its origin is obscure. Lami quotes the common opinion, based upon Francesco Galeotti's *Memorie di Pescia*, that it was the foundation of a rich and pious individual (*personaggio*), but himself inclines rather to the suggestion, which he finds in some very bad verses appended to the Rule of the Order, that it was founded by a company of twelve *persone da bene*. The verses are as follows:

La qual casa sia questa dell' Ospitale
La quale incominciò lo Coro duodenale.

It is probable that the "choir of twelve" referred to an original establishment of twelve brethren, and not to an endowment by twelve or any other number of pious founders.

The patrons of the hospice were St. James the elder and St. Egidius, "vulgarly and incorrectly called St. Giles". The house was provided with a bell called "La Smarrita", which was rung for an hour every evening, beginning a half hour before nightfall, to guide any who might be wandering in the forest to a place of safety, and this custom was still maintained to Lami's day. The head of the house was at first called Rector, afterward Master, Custos, Warden, and even Signor of Altopascio. The fame of the house drew visitors, both well and sick, received women in childbirth and infants, and attracted also great gifts and endowments, not only in Tuscany and other parts of Italy, but also in France, Navarre, Burgundy, Germany, Lorraine, Flanders, Savoy, and Dauphiné.

These foreign branches were called "mansiones", after the analogy of the old Roman relay stations along the main roads of the Empire. Their holdings of real estate and other valuable rights, tithes for example, seem from much later documents to have been under the control of the central house at Altopascio. Their rectors acknowledged the supremacy of the Grand Master (*Magister Generalis*). In Italy, especially in Tuscany, there seem to have been numerous properties of the Order widely distributed. Lami cites interesting documents from Florentine records showing the intimate relations of Altopascio with some of the most important families of the Republic.

In one of these, dated 1481, the Grand Master, a Capponi, receives permission from the apostolic legate to exchange certain estates in the city of Florence for lands in the region of Fucecchio contiguous to other properties of the Hospital—apparently an attempt to concentrate the holdings of Altopascio into one compact territory. The document is certified (*rogato*) by Antonio, son of Anastasio, son of Amerigo de' Vespucci, notary. In another document the same Master Capponi transfers a long list of places in the territories of Volterra and Pisa to "Giovanni, notary of the Apostolic See, canon of Florence, and son of Lorenzo the Magnificent", in exchange for Florentine real estate.

Several problems as to the purpose and functions of the Order of Altopascio have presented themselves to every writer who has touched upon the subject, and each has given his own conjecture as to their solution. Direct evidence is so slight that a modern inquirer has as much right to an opinion, or at least to a conjecture, as anyone

else. Two of these problems must be considered together. They relate to the symbol of the brethren and to the question whether they are properly to be described as primarily a bridge-building corporation.

As to the symbol: the simplest description of it is that it is like the Greek Tau, but there are certain peculiarities which seem to indicate some specific meaning. The vertical arm is always pointed at the end. The lateral arms are either square at the ends or are concaved or nicked like the arms of the Maltese cross. These peculiarities have led to the supposition that the vertical shaft represents an auger, and the cross bar a hammer or an axe. This interpretation has seemed to be a proof that the original purpose of the Order involved some kind of mechanical activity, probably carpenter work, and this was supposed to mark it as primarily devoted to bridge and road building.

Evidence on this point was found in various bits of documentary reference to the control of the hospice over certain bridges and its consequent duty to maintain them in safe condition for all wayfarers. An interesting specimen of this kind of document is an edict of the Emperor Frederick II. of 1244, confirming all the existing possessions and privileges of the hospice of "Altopassus". The motive of the act is given as a desire on the Emperor's part to show especial favor to all communities of persons devoting themselves to the care of the *miserabiles* of society. The properties of the House throughout Italy are enumerated, lands, forests, mills with the watercourses which supply them, etc. All these are to be held free from interference by any power whatsoever. Especially, all persons are forbidden to obstruct in any way the free passage of goods destined for the service of the hospice or to hinder the brethren in their coming and going about their business—*pro quacumque necessitate vel negotio suo*—anywhere in Italy by the imposition of any form of exaction.

The only requirement implied in the whole long document refers to the maintenance of a bridge.

It is our will and command that the hospice and its brethren build and maintain upon the public pilgrim's highway near Ficecum on the White Arno, at the most convenient point, a bridge for the service of travellers, and this without let or hindrance from any person whomsoever. But if, in case of flood or other accident, they shall be without a bridge, it is our will that they provide a ferry-boat for the free transportation of pilgrims, and it shall be unlawful for any other person to keep any boat there for passengers, whether for hire or not.

If this is a requirement it is also a privilege, not to be invaded by any outside party, and we may be quite sure that, although no tolls were

demanded at the ferry and presumably also none at the bridge, a pious contribution to the good work of the hospice would not be refused. So far as this document goes the technical character of the Order as an engineering corporation is not even hinted at.

The most decided opinion on the symbolic meaning of the T is given by Lami in another of his collections, the *Novelle Letterarie di Firenze* (1747). In reviewing very favorably a recent book he says:

There is only one little point as to which I cannot agree, namely the statement that the symbol of the Knights (*Cavalieri*) of Altopascio was a Tau, whereas any one who has examined it carefully in its original and ancient form on the campanile of the conventual church of the Knights at Altopascio can see plainly that it is not the letter Tau, but the representation of a woodworking tool like an auger, with the lower shaft pointed, it being one of the functions of these knights to build and repair bridges and roads. I call attention to this because I had the famous Cristofano Martini make a drawing from the original and engrave it on copper. I shall have occasion to speak of it in an historical work I am now preparing, and therefore I beg the learned Father Pauli [author of the book under review] to pardon me for mentioning it here.

The reference is undoubtedly to the *Hodoeporicon*, and it carries us back once more to the Arno journey of our friend Chariton. Slipping back into his own character, Lami goes on to speak of a visit to Altopascio in the month of September, 1740, "on my way to the festival of Santa Croce at Lucca", evidently one of the side-trips of the two Florentine travellers. From his notes made at the time he gives a description of the church and its campanile. On the façade of the church in recessed arches were three figures, an upper one of the Savior and two lower ones representing St. Peter and, probably, the patron St. James. Upon the open book in the hand of the latter appeared certain marks which were said to be the Roman numerals "LXV", and though Lami could not even read these himself, he ventures to prefix an "M" and so draws the conclusion that the church was built in 1065. The campanile was very lofty with a wide view over nearly the whole of the Valdinievole. On one of its walls near the ground was seen the "true symbol (*vera segna*) of the brethren of that hospice, that is, as it were a Tau with a pointed upright shaft and two transverse arms like the two arms of a Maltese cross".

From these meagre details we may be reasonably certain that the pointed T was the symbol of the Order of Altopascio; but as to the specific meaning of the symbol there is room for much doubt. I am not convinced that the actual building of roads and bridges was any more the special function of these brethren than of any other public-spirited landowner. Governmental control of such public

interests is a thing of rather recent date. Toll-roads and toll-bridges are but just disappearing from certain of our older American communities. The keeping up of such means of communication was one of the regular duties of the medieval landlord. He, of course, recouped himself for his outlay by taking toll of the traveller, often a very oppressive burden upon trade. When monastic communities undertook, as they often did, the redemption of waste lands by systematic foresting and drainage, they in their turn undoubtedly included in their civilizing labors the building and maintaining of roads and bridges. The charter of Frederick II. above mentioned expresses a typical situation. It confirms widely extended rights of property and imposes one condition of public service. Even the credulous Lami does not venture beyond a *forse* in his opinion that the Tau was intended to express the pontifical function of the Order. It is certainly a noteworthy fact, which did not escape Lami's observation, that in the Rule granted to the brethren of Altopascio by Pope Gregory IX. in 1239 there is not one hint of this aspect of their activities.

This edict of Gregory IX. seems to mark an epoch in the history of the Order. Its motive on the side of the pope is stated to be his desire to meet the pious wishes and sincere petitions of those who make requests to him, a general phrase of no special significance for the case in hand. It merely indicates that the initiative came from the side of the brethren, not from the papal court. Why the Order should have wished to change its rule at this time is not suggested in any way.³ A previous rule there may have been, but all trace of it has disappeared. The text of the papal bull is as follows:⁴

Gregory, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, to the Master and Brethren of the Hospital of Altopascio in the Diocese of Lucca, Greeting and Apostolic Benediction!

It is the practice of the apostolic see to respond favorably to pious requests and to grant its kindly favor to the sincere prayers of its petitioners. Wherefore, beloved sons in the Lord, we have inclined our

³ In Repetti, *Dizionario Geografico, Fisico, Storico della Toscana*, I. 76 (1833), the statement is made that Gregory IX. approved the Rule of the Hospital of Altopascio in 96 chapters in 1239.

The *Inventario del Reale Archivio di Stato in Lucca* (1872), I. 7, refers to the Rule as printed in part by Lami and completely by Fanfani.

Neither of these notices makes any reference whatever to the undoubted fact that the Rule was taken almost literally from that of St. John of the Hospital.

In the *Archivio Storico Italiano*, ser. IV., vol. XVI. (1885), p. 126, is a valuable article on the collection of Altopascian documents at Lucca. It mentions the Rule, but also fails to connect it with that of the Hospitallers.

⁴ Le Roux, *Cartulaire Général de l'Ordre des Hospitaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem* (4 vols., 1894), II. 566.

ear to your petition and have decided to grant to you and to your successors by these presents the Rule of the Brethren of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, to be observed forever in the Hospital of Altopassus and in all its dependent houses, the privileges previously granted by the apostolic see to your hospital to remain in full force.

We do not intend, however, that through this grant the Master and Brethren of the Hospital of Jerusalem shall acquire any rights or jurisdiction whatsoever over your hospital or its [subsidiary] houses. Let no one, therefore, encroach upon this our grant or act in rash opposition to it. If any one shall presume to attempt this, let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and his blessed Apostles, Peter and Paul.

Given at the Lateran on the 5th day
of April in the 13th year of our pontificate.

There seems to be no doubt that the Altopascians are properly to be classed under the general group of orders which followed the so-called "Rule of St. Augustine", but this would mean very little that could be called distinctive as to their functions or their ways of life. The Augustinian "Rule" was rather a series of counsels for the general conduct of the "religious" life than a code of prescriptions for strict observation. Its principles were capable of a great variety of application to the specific objects of various associations of men and women who desired to leave "the world" in order the better to accomplish what they believed to be the higher duties of social service. However useful such associations might be, and however lofty the aims they set before themselves, it was always among the possibilities that they would transgress the limits of traditional restraints and become dangerous to the dominant control of the central authority of the papacy. It is, therefore, quite possible that the acceptance of the more precisely defined Rule of St. John of Jerusalem may have been a means of bringing the Altopascians more distinctly under a system which had a more direct bearing upon the function that had come to be their chief reason for existence, namely, the maintenance of institutions for the regular care of the sick, especially those who were unable to provide for themselves. That they were not absorbed into the larger organization or even, in any strict sense, affiliated with it, is shown by the great care with which the papal edict provides that all their previous privileges shall be preserved and that the Order of St. John shall have no rights of jurisdiction whatsoever over them. It is probably not going too far to say that, even after 1239, they continued to be "Augustinian Friars" as before, the new rule merely defining more specifically the details of their duty, and thus making the control of their officials as well as of the ultimate papal authority more efficient. As late as 1358 they are referred to in Pescian documents as living under the Rule of St. Augustine.

This reference to the conditions of the Pescian branch of the Altopascian hospital gives us some illuminating glimpses of the relations of the Order to their neighbors and also to the papal government. The chronicler says:⁵

At that time the Grand Master was Messer Jacopo da Pescia. He accepted as brethren of the Order many citizens of Pescia who were married men and who took the habit in order to escape the payment of taxes and avoid doing guard duty, to the very great detriment of the community. When the commune perceived that the greed (*ingordigia*) of these friars was over great it deputed a magistrate to see that the commune was protected and to take such action as was best for the service of God and of the public. This magistrate, having heard and well considered what these friars had been doing, gave orders that they should be driven out of Pescia and its territory and should not be allowed to enter it. He made proclamation that whoever had any claim against the Master and his friars should bring it before the chancellor of the community, and that no person should work the properties of the friars or cause them to be worked, under heavy penalties. He sent messengers to the [papal] legate, to the Signoria of Florence and to Messer Andrea da Todi, the papal collector, to notify them of his action. The result of this policy of the commune was that the Master and the friars refrained from taking married men as brethren, but when an occasion arose for receiving such the Master wrote to the commune commanding himself, the friars, and the hospitals to the protection of the same. This letter was read in the Grand Council and referred by it to the above-mentioned magistrate for the necessary action. After due consideration of the whole matter he decided that certain married men of Pescia were not and could not be brethren of that Order, but were subject to the jurisdiction of the commune of Pescia. Messer Andrea da Todi, the papal collector, also gave orders that the Master should not in future receive any married person, and that those friars who were married should have no vote in the chapter.

We see here a very clear illustration of one of the lower motives for entrance into the "religious" life, the escape from civic burdens, a practice offensive alike to the civil authorities and to the disciplinary agencies of the papal supervision.

During the preparation of this article the complete Rule of Altopascio was accessible to me only in the edition of Fanfani cited above. This is an Italian text, which the editor believed to be a translation from a lost Latin original. His edition is without scholarly merit, except in so far as the language is concerned, his interest being apparently more in the "literary curiosity" of the Rule than in its historical value. The Rule of St. John of Jerusalem, on the other hand, we have in the magnificent edition of Le Roulx, in the first and second volumes of his *Cartulaire Général de l'Ordre des Hospitaliers*. Preparatory to this edition Le Roulx had published a very careful analytical study

⁵ Lami, *Deliciae Eruditorum*, XVI, 1358.

in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 1887. The unsystematic modern treatment of the whole subject is shown by the fact that only at an advanced stage of my inquiry did I learn from a foot-note in Le Roulx's *Cartulaire* that a Latin text of the Altopascian Rule of 1239 exists in the National Archives at Paris.⁶ The several elements composing this rule have been very carefully and briefly summarized by M. Léon Le Grand in a note to his article on "Les Maisons-Dieu, leur Statuts au XIII^e Siècle", in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, July, 1896. Neither the Italian editor Fanfani, nor his sponsor, Lami, appears to have had any personal knowledge of this text, though Fanfani does say that Du Cange cites passages from a Latin version in the archiepiscopal archives at Paris. His interest in the question is only to show that the Italian text which he gives is not a contemporary version of 1239, but was made considerably later from the Latin, "in which monastic rules of that day were written".

The earliest form of the Rule of St. John was issued by the Grand Master Raymond du Puy between the years 1125 and 1153 and is probably a systematic summary of the regulations under which the Order had been living up to that time, with such added details as had become necessary. Consisting at first of nineteen brief chapters, the Rule was increased by the addition of statutes and by collections of "judgments" (*esgards*) and customs (*usances*) at considerable intervals of time. The last of these additions which concerns us was made in the thirteenth century, and it is interesting to notice that the approximate date of its publication is in part determined by a comparison with the Rule of Altopascio. The first twenty of the *esgards* correspond very closely with chapters 53 to 75 of that rule, and several others are similar in substance to other chapters. It is evident, therefore, that at least these *esgards* and *usances* were established before the year 1239, when the Altopascians received the Rule of the Hospitallers.

A careful comparison of the two rules shows us that the first nineteen chapters of the Rule of Raymond du Puy were taken over bodily to form the first twenty-five sections of the new rule and that the greater part of the remaining sections were selected from the later statutes, judgments, and customs of the Hospital of St. John, with only such changes as were necessary to fit the circumstances of the newly organized Order of Altopascio.

⁶ Through the courtesy of this *Review* a photographic copy of this Paris manuscript was procured, but only in time for a very hasty examination. It is written on 21 pages 8½ by 6 inches. The paragraphs correspond in general with those in the Italian version.

If we examine the Rule of Altopascio in either version, we find it divided into ninety-six chapters. Of these the first twenty-five, corresponding as we have seen to the nineteen of Raymond du Puy's Rule for the Hospitallers, refer to the ordinary conduct of the brethren in their hospital. Chapters 30 to 37, probably taken from the additions to the Rule of St. John made by the Grand Master Jobert (1177-1181), contain regulations about the death and burial of brethren. Chapters 39 to 45, corresponding to the additions of Grand Master Roger de Molins in 1181 (1182), deal with the care of the sick. Chapters 49 to 52 define the ceremonies at the reception of brethren and of the affiliated members (*confrati*). What may fairly be called the "criminal code" of Altopascio is contained in chapters 53 to 75 and is taken almost literally from the *esgards* of the Hospitallers. Chapters 47 to 52 and chapter 76 are derived from the *usances*. The few remaining chapters I have not been able to identify with any of the provisions of the Rule of St. John.

Certain problems as to the functions and organization of the Order suggest themselves upon a closer study. Was this primarily an order of laymen? Evidently Marsiglio of Padua (1324) thought it was; otherwise his criticism of the attempt on the part of the Curia to include its members under the term *clericis* would have had no point. Nothing in the Rule gives specific information on this subject, but instructive side-lights are thrown upon it in several places. For example, in the chapters prescribing the ceremonies upon the death of a brother the text reads:

Where the body of a brother of the Hospital shall be buried, there let his name be written in the calendar, and after thirty days let there be an anniversary day for him forever. If in the church where the *treccennario* [memorial service of thirty days] is celebrated there are three priests, let one celebrate the *treccennario* and the two others sing the masses for the day. If there are two priests, the service of the *treccennario* is to be divided between them, *and the fees also*. In a church where there is only one priest another is to be called in from outside to perform the *treccennario*, and when this is completed he is to receive as a gratuity (*caritatevilemente* [sic]), one *bzant* and a shirt and a new pair of breeches, according to the custom of the House. But, if no [outside] priest can be found, the priest of the House alone may perform the *treccennario*, celebrating mass daily for the dead, excepting on Sundays and holy days, and then let a special commemoration for the dead brother be made; but, after thirty days, let the number of thirty days on which only special masses are said for the dead brother be completed, and then let the priest have the aforesaid gratuity.

Now were these priests members of the order? The repeated emphasis upon the payment of fees suggests that they were not; for one of the fundamental principles of the Order was the renunciation

of private property. On the other hand there are many indications that some of the brethren were, or might be, ordained clergymen. For example, in chapter 64 (*csgard 10*) it is provided that

if any brother, being priest or deacon or of any other clerical order, shall commit any offense, and this shall come to the knowledge of the Prior or the Master, the brethren whom the Prior shall select for the court shall judge with righteous judgment and shall impose a penance of seven days or even of forty according to the gravity of the fault, just as in the case of other brethren who are not in holy orders. For, seeing that we are all of one religion and all, both clergy and laymen, make the same profession, it seems unfitting that there should be any distinction between brethren within the Hospital. Wherefore it is ordered that, as we live under one rule, so also we ought to be subject to the same judges of the rule.

My conclusion is, therefore, that the Altopascians were primarily a lay order, but that in each house a certain number of the brethren were ordained, presumably first as deacons and then as priests, in order to conduct the regular services of the hospital church. On special occasions ordained clergymen from the outside might be brought in, and in such cases were to be paid a suitable honorarium; but if no such outside priest was available, then the regular priest might perform the special service and, in view of the extra duty, might receive a fee therefor. Such fees were presumably paid out of the common fund.

As regards discipline the lay and clerical brethren were on an equality. For example, on the question of private property chapter 20 of the Rule provided that

if any brother at the time of his death shall have any property which he has concealed from the Master, he shall be buried without divine service as a person excommunicate. And if during his life concealed money shall be found upon him, it shall be hanged about his neck and he shall be stripped and soundly flogged through the Hospital of St. James at Altopascio or any other house where he may belong, by a clergymen, if he be a clergymen, and by a layman, if he be a layman. And let him do penance for forty days and fast the fourth and sixth days of the week on bread and water.

In Du Breul's account of the Paris establishment *du Hault-Pas* it is stated that some of the higher officials were represented on tombs with the insignia of ordination, and from this Helyot draws the conclusion that the brethren must, at least in the later period of the Order, have been clergymen. The argument does not appear convincing. Certainly it cannot apply to the earlier and more natural conditions reflected in the Rule itself. There the clerical member is plainly the exception. It would not, however, be extraordinary if,

as the process deprecated by Marsiglio went on, the proportion of lay and clerical members should have changed. If this was the case, the term "canon" as applied to the brethren by Helyot would not be out of place. As to the further question, whether they were simply "canons regular" or "canons hospitallers", we need not concern ourselves.

Certainly, so far as the Rule informs us, the organized care of the sick in hospitals was their reason for existence. Minute regulations for the comfort of their "masters" (*domini, signori*), as the patients are called, show an enlightened conception of the needs of the sick that would do credit to any modern institution. Four skilled physicians and two surgeons are to be attached to the House. They must be competent to make examinations of urine, to diagnose the cases of illness, and to furnish the appropriate syrups, mixtures, and other remedies. They are to prohibit what is injurious to the sick and supply them with what is beneficial. The weaker the patient, the more carefully must they study the case and be prepared to restore him to health. Dietary details indicate that a hearty diet was considered advisable, even in Lent, but unwholesome foods, such as eels, cheese, peas, beans, and cabbage, are positively forbidden to "our lords the sick". The beds are to be comfortably large with separate sheets and coverlets. Every patient is to have a good fur wrap *per andare ad luogo commune* and also a woolen cap. For the babies born in the House there are to be little cribs or cradles, "so that they may lie by themselves and that no inconvenience or accident may happen to the nursing mother".

Another problem which has interested inquirers is whether the brethren of Altopascio may properly be described as "knights" (*chevaliers, cavalieri*). It would seem natural that, in accepting the rule of a distinctively military order, some definite indication would be given on this point. The only extended reference to it is in chapter 93, which is an almost literal transcript of a paragraph in the regulations of the Hospitallers adopted at Margat in Syria in 1204-1206.

Let no one demand to be made a knight while he is in the Hospital, unless this had been promised him before he took the habit of a religious, and then only if he has reached the age at which he might have become a knight if he had remained in the world. Nevertheless the sons of noblemen, especially if they have been brought up in the Hospital, when they have reached military age, may, with the consent of the Master and[or] of the Prior (*comandeur, comandatore*), and with the approval of the brethren of the House, be invested with the insignia of knighthood.

One other incidental reference is in chapter 78, which describes the ceremonies to be observed at the election of a Master. The first step is the selection by the Prior of three brethren, a priest, a knight, and a servitor (*sergent, servente*), who form the nucleus of an electoral committee. This provision also is taken bodily from the additions of Margat, where it is given only in an old French form, all the other articles being in both a French and a Latin text. In default of all evidence as to any military activity of the Altopascians, is it not a reasonable suggestion that the word *chevalier* as used here is meant to express rather the character of a "gentleman" than that of a fighting man? Although these two ideas pretty nearly cover each other in medieval usage, it is not difficult to understand that a youth of good family, though he had deserted "the world", should not be willing to forfeit whatever respect might attach to a formal investment with the knightly title. I make this suggestion for what it is worth, which is not very much; but perhaps it may be worth while to remind ourselves of the usage persisting to the present day of dubbing as "knights" distinguished representatives of scholarship or of political or social eminence, or even the ordinary members of certain semi-religious orders. It is also worthy of note that in adopting the Rule of St. John all references to military matters were omitted. For example, in describing what requisitions might be made by the brethren for their personal needs, all mention of horses and their equipment, as well as of weapons, was left out.

The passage above cited in reference to the election of the Master might seem to indicate that the terms priest, knight, and servitor were meant to include the whole body of the brethren, but even this leaves room for doubt. If it is true, as we have supposed, that ordination as priest and the creation of chevaliers were exceptional matters, we should be obliged to conclude that the servitors formed the great majority of members. Against this supposition, however, we have many references to servitors as forming also a class by themselves, living in the Hospital under peculiar conditions. They are constantly contrasted with the *fratres* as having different rights and needing special protection. For example, chapter 67:

If a friar shall strike a servitor, and this shall come to the knowledge of the Prior of the House, let him do penance for seven days. If blood flows, except from the nose, let him do penance for forty days; but, if the servitor dies from the wound, the friar shall lose his habit and shall be sent to Rome to our lord the pope for his penance. After that, if he receive letters from the pope and ask for mercy, he may be received back, saving the justice of the house, and shall do penance for forty days.

On the other hand, the servitor was strictly bound to respect the person of the friar. Chapter 68 prescribes:

If a servitor assaults a friar, and the friar reports it to the Prior, let the servitor do penance. But, if he shall call the friar a thief or a fornicator or a malefactor under the house rules (*della casa*), and cannot prove the charge, let him be severely flogged by the friars, first through the house, then to the door, and out of the house; nevertheless, let him be paid what is owing to him.

So again in chapters 69 and 70:

In the case of a servitor who quits without permission and then returns to make amends, if his service is paid at the discretion of the Hospital (*ad caritatem*), first let him do penance and, for the time since the beginning of the year, let nothing be reckoned to him. But if he is serving on contract (*ad convenzione*), after he has done his penance, let the time of his actual service be reckoned to him, and at the end of the year, let him be paid his price, that is, what is due him.

If a servitor steals property of the Hospital, even a whole loaf of bread, or shall sell the same, and it be clearly proven, let the stolen property be hanged about his neck, and let him be soundly flogged through the house to the door, and at the door let him be given a loaf of bread and be discharged, and let him have what he has earned—but this at the discretion of the Prior and the friars.

Servitors are to be punished severely for fighting among themselves, for refusing to work, for spending the night in town without permission, but in every case involving dismissal they are to be paid whatever is due them. The status of the servitor is, therefore, clearly defined. He is a distinctly inferior person to the friar. This is most clearly shown in chapter 72:

Servitors may not testify against a friar except on a charge involving penance of seven days. If they have the presumption to attempt this on a charge of forty days' penance, they shall not be heard. If they try to testify to a crime for which a friar would lose his habit, they shall not be believed—unless he be caught in the act—which God forbid!

The servitor is thus obviously indicated as a hired man serving for pay, either at the discretion of the officers of the House, or on a specific contract. His social inferiority is indicated in the characteristic medieval fashion by strictly limiting the confidence to be placed in his given word. At every point he is sharply contrasted with the "friar" *par excellence*.

Are we, then, to conclude that there was a fourth class of members constituting the main body of the *fratres*? This does not seem probable as a permanent condition; but it may well have been possible in the time of transition from the situation before 1239 to that after that date. It does not appear that the word *cavalieri* is applied to the

Order as a whole in its early period, but later the members are frequently referred to as the "Knights of Altopascio". And yet, no one could think of them as a military order in any strict sense of the word. In the Rule the *fratres* are constantly mentioned in distinction from both the *cavalieri* and the *serventes*. Only in connection with priests does a composite—*frate preite*—occur.

A certain suggestion of a way out of this confusion may be found in article 45 of the Rule, relating to the care of the sick:

Finally, besides the daily care and watchfulness which the brethren of the Hospital are bound to exercise with zeal and devotion toward the needy poor, as toward their masters, it is added in Chapter General that in each corridor (*ruga*), i.e., ward (*piazza*) of the house of the Hospital, where the patients lie, nine servitors shall be placed at their service, who, under the orders of the brethren, shall bathe the heads and feet of the sick and dry them with towels. They shall keep them tidy (*forbano*), shall make their beds, bring them their meals, and supply them carefully with drink, and, in general, whatever is needful and useful for the sick they shall obediently do.

The picture presented by this article is sufficiently clear: the regular work of the Hospital was to be done by serving-men under the orders of the *fratres*. It is the business of the brethren to give orders, of the servitors to obey. Nine servants to each room seems a more than ample provision, but this number was simply taken over directly from the Rule of St. John and doubtless meant only as many as were needed to do the work carefully and thoroughly.

Now, taking this as the normal situation, we shall not find it difficult to suppose that one of the objects of adopting the Rule of the Hospitallers of St. John was to accentuate this division of function by introducing a new name for the superior brethren. Henceforth the *frater* was regularly to be a *chevalier*. The community of knights was the governing, property-holding, executive element. The ordinary, daily work, for which in theory the institution existed, was to be done by servants, who were paid for their services and were held under strict discipline by their superiors.

The second quarter of the thirteenth century was a time of great activity in monastic development. The two new mendicant orders of St. Francis and St. Dominic had given a vigorous fillip to the declining energy of the Benedictine system. What would nowadays be called "aggressive social service" was the dominant passion of the generation within which the change of rule of the Altopascians took place. Their work had outgrown the limitations of the Augustinian "Rule" and called for a stricter organization, such as the Rule of St. John was well calculated to supply.

Were the Altopascians bridge-builders (*fratres pontifices*) in any technical sense? One article of the Rule gives a negative hint on this point. Chapter 92, taken from the *usances* of the Hospitallers, reads: "Let every one who enters the religion of the Hospital do, while he is in the House, the kind of service which he did in the world, or any other which may be imposed upon him." Here, if anywhere, one might expect to find some reference to the primary function of the Order; but nothing of the kind appears. The sole duty referred to in the Rule is that of caring for the traveller, sick or well, and especially the maintenance of a hospital. If bridge-building had been a special duty of the brethren, it seems hardly possible that some indication of this should not have crept into some paragraph of the newly adopted regulations. In fact, the more one inquires into the whole subject of the supposed "pontifical brethren", the more one is inclined to doubt whether any such order ever existed. The tradition on the subject dies hard. It crops up in paragraphs such as we cited at the beginning of this article, and it is mentioned without much detail in books of reference. Its tenacity of life is probably in great part owing to the popular appeal of a legend centring about the person of a typical saintly figure.

This is the legend of St. Bénézet, local in the region about Avignon and preserved in a Latin and a Provençal text of perhaps the end of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century. The gist of the legend is that a youthful shepherd, guarding the flocks of his mother, was summoned by an unearthly voice, which proved to be that of Jesus, to build a bridge over the Rhône at Avignon. He obeyed the divine call, presented himself before the authorities, both lay and clerical, was naturally laughed at as a fool, but demonstrated his ability by miraculous signs, and finally the bridge was built. As to the process of the building, the legend says not a word beyond the first miraculous placing of the corner-stone "which thirty men could not move, but which he carried as easily as if it had been a stone that could be thrown with the hand, and set it in its place". Hereupon the previously incredulous magistrate called the boy and gave him three hundred *solidi*, kissing his hands and feet. And there upon the spot he collected five thousand *solidi*.

That is the whole of the original story. The suggestion of it is obvious. The people of the region wanted a bridge, but had not been sufficiently roused to undertake the work. The story of a wonder-working youth—or, as he appears in other versions, of a tottering old man—so rouses their enthusiasm that they at once open a popular subscription, and, in the course of eleven years, the thing

was done. It was a great undertaking, and it would have been quite out of character with the time if it had not been accompanied by all sorts of miraculous occurrences. Bénézet was said to have died in the seventh year after the beginning of the bridge and to have been buried in a chapel over the third pier. The miracles wrought through him in his life were continued after his death, and he became a patron saint of the craft of bridge engineers.

Our inquiry is: What was the relation of this craft to the Order of Altopascio, or indeed to any other known religious order? That every medieval handicraft was organized and that every such organization had a certain religious character is well known. The question is whether there was a definitely recognized religious order primarily devoted to this purpose. Helyot devotes a special section to what he calls *Religieux Hospitaliers Pontifes*. The greater part of it is an analysis of the Bénézet legend and its bearings upon the existence of a bridge-building order in southern France. The outcome is that Helyot identifies the various reported associations of Hospitallers in charge of bridges in the Rhône Valley with the brethren of Altopascio, who by the end of the twelfth century had extended their foundations as far as this toward the west.

An early indication of doubt as to the existence of an order of *fratres pontifices* is found in a little treatise by Henri Grégoire in 1818. He discusses at length the evidences for an order of "Pontiffs", as if its existence were an acknowledged fact; but then, coming to the Altopascians, he says: "Helyot assumes that the Order of Pontiffs is none other than that of the Hospitallers of St. James du Haut Pas at Lucca, to which he is pleased to assign St. Bénézet. The identity of these Hospitallers with the Pontiffs is, if not certain, at least possible, but Helyot gives no proofs for this opinion in his incomplete and in many respects incorrect notice." Grégoire then refers to our friend Lami, giving some rather hit-or-miss selections from the *Hodoeporicon*, and concludes that Lami also regarded the Altopascians as a bridge-building order.

During the last century several attempts were made to clear up the whole subject of St. Bénézet and the bridge-building craft. In 1876 the Abbé Albanès published for the first time the Provençal text of the Bénézet legend, with comments tending to support the tradition of his foundation of an order whose primary function was that of building bridges. The whole attitude of Albanès is credulous, at times unctuously so, showing an evident desire to save the pretty story, even at the price of a severe strain upon his wish to be historical.

Two years later, in 1878, the subject was taken up by M. F. Lefort, a practical engineer, a member of the corporation of the Ponts et Chaussées, in the *Revue des Questions Historiques*, XXIII, 555. He gives as the result of an independent study of the documents his opinion that the legend of St. Bénézet was made up about a century after the alleged fact, while the accompanying testimony of witnesses to the miracles of the saintly youth may well have been put into shape somewhat earlier. The engineer, as well as the abbé, saves his orthodoxy by protesting his entire faith in the "sanctity" of Bénézet and expressing the pious wish that the "Ponts et Chausées" would renew the celebration of his memory as their patron saint as it was before 1789.

This French controversy was followed in 1889 by a series of articles in the *Historisch-politische Blätter für das Katholische Deutschland*, LXXXVII, 89, 184, 245, by one Falk. These are a collection of scattered references to the activity of churchmen in all parts of Europe in the matter of bridge-building, without order or connection. The references to Altopascio are too meagre to be of any value. The judicious writer of the article on bridge-builders in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* says: "These articles of Falk are to be used with caution." This contribution to the *Encyclopedia* well reflects the uncertainty which surrounds the whole subject. The writer accepts the theory that there were orders of bridge-builders, but he doubts whether they can be classed as "religious". "Their origins", he says, "are wrapped in much obscurity."

My own conclusion, drawn from these many conflicting bits of evidence, is that there never was such a thing as a general order of *Fratres Pontifices*. Bridges requiring a high degree of engineering skill were certainly built in the period coincident with the highest development of medieval architecture. Bridge-building, like church-building, was a "meritorious" work for which the Church was ready to give its own peculiar forms of reward. As with church-building again, the mechanical processes were sure to be accompanied by miraculous evidences of divine approval. As in every other form of medieval enterprise, some kind of association was bound to develop here, and such association must have as its central figure a recognized patron equipped with all the necessary decoration of supernatural powers. This sufficiently accounts for the engaging figure of St. Bénézet, a vivid localization of things that actually happened. Helyot may have been right in identifying the Altopascians with the local Provençal hospital corporations, but that does not convert them into *fratres pontifices*. In applying to be invested with the Rule of St.

John in 1239 they certainly did not do this as bridge-builders, but as brethren of mercy toward the *miserables* of the world, as the charter of Frederick II. five years later puts it.

This conclusion as to a general, widespread pontifical order does not exclude the probability that groups of engineering craftsmen proposing to undertake definite bridge-building projects were granted the proceeds of papal or episcopal "indulgences" to provide the necessary funds. But this again is far from being the same thing as the creation of an "order" in any accepted meaning of the word.

The uncertainty which surrounds the history of Altopascio during the period of its development covers also the story of its decline. There seems little room for doubt that it followed the same process of deterioration that has marked the history of most religious orders. The acquisition of large landed estates was a constant temptation to the neglect of the functions for which the order primarily existed. Such properties became in their turn a temptation to authorities, clerical as well as lay, to confiscate them to other uses. The conversion of monastic properties in England to educational purposes—not to mention less worthy objects—is a monumental example of such high-handed measures.

In the case of Altopascio the crisis seems to have been reached in the year 1459, 220 years after its incorporation under the Rule of St. John. At that moment the all-absorbing interest of western Christendom was the peril of the Turk. Constantinople had fallen, and the outposts of Christianity toward the East were in imminent danger of extinction. To meet this danger Pope Pius II., scholar, diplomat, patron of the arts, was prepared to take drastic measures—at least on paper.

On the eighteenth of January, 1459, he issued a memorable decree creating a new military order of Hospitallers, to be called the Knights of St. Mary of Bethlehem and to have its headquarters on the island of Lemnos. The decree begins with a recital of the lamentable decay of certain *religiones*, "so that scarcely as many members are to be found as there are houses for them". The pope is hoping to summon a General Council to provide against the threatening advance of the Turks "or even to exterminate them", but meanwhile, with the approval of the College of Cardinals, he proposes to establish a military order which shall do for the Dardanelles and the adjacent islands the kind of service which the "Knights of Rhodes" are doing for the African coast. To pay the expenses of this great undertaking he has determined "to dedicate, apply, appropriate, annex, and incor-

porate" the properties of six *religiones*, including that of St. James of Altopascio.

Further, we suppress and annul their former ordinances (*ordinces*), the names of their associations, their titles of priority (*priorales*) and other dignities, and we decree that henceforth they shall be called, held, and named as of that military order of St. Mary of Bethlehem. Moreover, in this order there shall be brethren and knights and priests as also in the aforesaid Order of Rhodes, and the head of the aforesaid Hospital of St. Mary of Bethlehem shall be the Master, elected by the brethren in the same way (*pariformiter*) [as in the Order of Rhodes].

So far as formal legislation could do it, therefore, the Order of Altopascio was extinguished in 1459. Later references to it, notably in France, may probably be explained by the persistence of ancient titles and by the difficulty of carrying out fully the intentions of the papal decree. The new order of St. Mary, at all events, disappeared after the capture of Lemnos by the Turks, and I have found no reference to it in later documents.

EPHRAIM EMERTON.

BISMARCK AND RUSSIA IN 1863

BISMARCK's début in international politics was made in connection with the Polish crisis of 1863, and it is generally held that he came through this first test with brilliant success. The Alvensleben Convention, in particular, although almost unanimously condemned by the public at that time, is now commonly regarded as "a master stroke . . . perhaps the most fruitful act of his career",¹ "the corner-stone of Prussia's future greatness".² By it he is said to have averted the danger of a Franco-Russian alliance and of a Russo-Polish reconciliation, to have gained for Prussia the tsar's exclusive friendship and warm gratitude, and to have assured for himself that Russian support without which he could scarcely have succeeded in his wars of the next seven years. Similarly, he has claimed and received much credit for having, in the summer of 1863, refused Russia's proposals for a joint attack on Austria and France. He had the chance with Russian aid to strike down his two most dangerous future opponents and to realize German unity at once, but he overcame this temptation through a sound conviction that "German unity must be effected without foreign influence by the nation's own strength".³ Thus, by his vigorous action in the one case and his wise self-restraint in the other, at the very beginning of his career in power he showed himself a past master of diplomacy and paved the way for all his later triumphs.

This traditional view of Bismarck's policy toward Russia and the Polish question in 1863 rests almost wholly upon Bismarck's own authority and that of Heinrich von Sybel—that is, upon *ex parte* statements from the Prussian side. Moreover, these accounts have left very large gaps in our knowledge of the subject and they contain not a few contradictions and improbabilities, some of which have already been pointed out by critical historians.⁴ Hence an effort will be made in the following pages, chiefly with the aid of unpublished materials from the Russian archives, to re-examine the two chief episodes in Russo-Prussian relations in 1863: the Alvensleben Con-

¹ Matter, *Bismarck*, II. 79.

² Sybel, *Die Begründung des Deutschen Reiches*, II. 518. Cf. La Gorce, *Histoire du Second Empire*, IV. 433; Welschinger, *Bismarck*, p. 59, etc.

³ *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, II. 64.

⁴ See Lenz, "König Wilhelm und Bismarck in Gastein", *Deutsche Rundschau*, CXXIX. (1906) 354-362.

vention and the negotiations for a war alliance against France and Austria.

I.

The insurrection in Russian Poland broke out on the night of January 22-23, 1863. The news which reached Berlin in rather exaggerated form on the twenty-fourth can scarcely have come as a surprise, for serious trouble had obviously been brewing in Poland for at least two years, and it is not unlikely that Prussian statesmen had long been considering what should be done if matters came to a head. Prussia's interests and Prussia's traditions alike seemed to require that she should take a firm stand by the side of Russia. In the frequently occurring Polish insurrections of that time the two powers were accustomed to offer each other all the aid that might be required. During the Polish revolution of 1830-1831 Prussia had promptly mobilized on the frontier four army corps under Gneisenau; she had closed the border to munitions and reinforcements for the insurgents; disarmed and sometimes handed over to the Russians the Polish forces driven across the boundary; and allowed the Russians every facility for using Prussian territory. Gneisenau had even proposed armed intervention in order to help crush the revolt before France could interfere.⁵ Similarly, during the uprising in Prussian Poland in 1848 Russia had offered Berlin her active assistance.⁶ By a treaty of 1833 the two courts had guaranteed to each other their Polish possessions and had bound themselves to render aid, if required, in order to put down Polish insurrections.⁷

It was, therefore, quite in accordance with precedent when, already on January 24, 1863, King William ordered comprehensive military measures, intended to avert any outbreak in the province of Posen and to close the Prussian frontier to the insurgents. Either then or shortly afterward orders were given for the mobilization of four army corps—half of the Prussian army.

On the afternoon of the twenty-fourth, Oubril, the new Russian envoy at Berlin, had his first audience with the king, at which the news from Poland naturally furnished the chief subject of discussion. Acting upon instructions received from the authorities at Warsaw, Oubril expressed the hope that the Prussian government would not refuse, if it were asked for some assistance, such as the arrest of insurgents fleeing across the border; and he added that he would like

⁵ Pertz-Delbrück, *Leben Gneisenaus*, V. 648-651.

⁶ Martens, *Recueil des Traités, Conventions . . . conclus par la Russie*, VIII.

371.

⁷ Martens, *op. cit.*, VIII. 187-193.

to transmit to the emperor the assurance that, no matter what dimensions the uprising might assume, his court could count on Prussia's favorable attitude. To both suggestions the king gave a hearty assent.⁸ These vague allusions to the possibility that Russia might need some measure of assistance were apparently the sole provocation from the Russian side to the rather astonishing *démarche* which Prussia now undertook.

II.

At first it was resolved to send General Gustav von Alvensleben to Warsaw to study the situation and ascertain what assistance Prussia could render. Three days later the plan assumed a much more ambitious character: the king's adjutant, Major von Rauch, was to go to Warsaw, while Alvensleben was to be sent directly to St. Petersburg.⁹ Of the proceedings within the Prussian cabinet that led to these decisions, we know very little; but it is difficult to credit the story, which was later circulated, that Alvensleben's mission was arranged behind Bismarck's back by the king and his military cabinet.¹⁰ It is far more probable that Bismarck was the prime mover in the affair, and it is certain that he drew up Alvensleben's instructions.¹¹ Of the content of these instructions we are told little more than that the envoy was charged to get as complete information as possible as to the situation in Poland and on the Neva; to strengthen the tsar's resistance to the pro-Polish party among his advisers; and "above all, to seek to pave the way for an understanding with the emperor regarding the joint suppression of the uprising". He was "to rattle at pleasure with the Prussian sabre".¹² He also bore a letter from King William to his imperial nephew.

Alvensleben left Berlin February 2. His arrival in St. Petersburg apparently aroused little enthusiasm in Prince Gorchakov, the Russian vice-chancellor and minister of foreign affairs, who seems to have resented so ostentatious a demonstration of unsolicited and unneeded helpfulness. But Alexander, always full of veneration for his uncle, received the envoy with grateful cordiality and readily

⁸ Oubril to Gorchakov, no. 14, Jan. 17/29. The Russian documents cited are in the Principal Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Petrograd.

⁹ Sybel, *op. cit.*, II, 505 (fourth edition).

¹⁰ This story, which Bismarck himself was said to have helped to circulate after matters had begun to go wrong with the Alvensleben Convention, is repeated and later refuted in Bernhardi's diary (*Aus dem Leben Theodor von Bernhardis*, V, 37 ff.) and in the *Memoirs and Letters of Sir Robert Morier*, I, 304.

¹¹ William to Bismarck, Feb. 1, 1863, in Berner, *Kaiser Wilhelm des Grossen Briefe, Reden, und Schriften*, II, 46-47.

¹² Sybel, *op. cit.*, II, 505-506. Hengelmüller, "Graf Alois Karolyi," *Deutsche Revue* (1914), III, 39.

assented to all his proposals. Scarcely more than two days of discussion was required, and on February 8 the famous agreement commonly called "the Alvensleben Convention" was signed.

The genesis, the nature, and the scope of this ephemeral arrangement were all to become the subject of rather vehement controversy between the contracting parties. Within a few weeks Bismarck was to declare, and Sybel has since perpetuated the story, that Alvensleben had neither the necessary instructions nor the authority to conclude a written agreement; that the Convention was proposed and drafted by Gorchakov, and accepted by King William, in spite of his feeling that it went further than he desired to go, simply out of a desire to please the Russians.¹³ But Bismarck launched this story at a time when he was trying to slip out of an agreement that might lead him into war with France. The Russians promptly replied with an indignant and categorical denial, affirming not only that "it was at Berlin that a written agreement had been insisted upon", but that Alvensleben had kept repeating, "*Der König will etwas schriftliches haben*".¹⁴ Gorchakov declared that the Prussian envoy had even submitted to him orally the complete draft of the arrangement, and that he and his assistant, Jomini, had done no more than put Alvensleben's German into French. And, judging from the detailed historical résumé of the negotiation which Jomini transmitted to Berlin and which even Bismarck was unable to controvert, it seems well-nigh certain that the proposal to draft a written agreement came from the Prussian side; that Alvensleben originated at least most of the provisions of the act; and that the reluctant Russian diplomats did little more than strive to attenuate the transaction, and to minimize its importance.

It was characteristic of the situation that Bismarck then, and Sybel later, insisted on calling the agreement a "convention", while the Russians would never dignify it with any higher name than "arrangement". As a matter of fact, the document did not bear either the title or the usual forms of a convention, and Gorchakov boasted that these omissions were "intentional on our part".¹⁵

The terms of the agreement were brief and simple. It was stipulated that at the request of the Russian commander in the kingdom of Poland, or of the Prussian commander in the east (General Wer-

¹³ Oubril to Gorchakov, no. 65, Feb. 17/Mar. 1. Sybel, *op. cit.*, II. 507. Cf. Goltz to Bismarck, Dec. 12, 1863, *Bismarck-Jahrbuch*, V. 240.

¹⁴ Gorchakov's marginal note on Oubril's report, no. 65. Jomini to Oubril, Feb. 21/Mar. 5.

¹⁵ Marginal comments on Oubril's report, no. 47, and private letter of Feb. 10/22.

der), or of the frontier authorities of either country, the Russian and Prussian forces should be authorized to lend each other mutual assistance and, in case of need, to cross the frontier in order to pursue rebels who might pass from one country to the other. Special officers were to be sent by each side to the headquarters of the two armies and to the commanders of detached forces, in order to put this understanding into effect. These officers were to be kept informed of the distribution of troops in order to communicate it to their respective chiefs. A secret article provided that the two powers would communicate to each other all information as to political agitation affecting either the kingdom of Poland or the grand-duchy of Posen. The final article, which may well be ascribed to Gorchakov, stated that this act was to remain in force as long as the situation required and the two courts deemed appropriate.¹⁶

III.

The "Convention" was negotiated in two days and lasted barely four weeks; but it proved uncommonly fruitful of troubles of all sorts, particularly between the two contracting powers, although this side of its history has hitherto been little known.

First of all, Bismarck, after having in a sense imposed his services upon Russia, straightway attempted to give that co-operation a scope and character that aroused alarm at St. Petersburg. A pretext for action was furnished him by the fact that during the first weeks of the uprising the Russians had had to concentrate their troops in the interior of Poland, with the result that the districts adjacent to the frontier were left in the hands of the insurgents, and the Russian customs officials were frequently obliged to take refuge on Prussian soil. Hence the moment the "Convention" was signed, Bismarck (February 8) informed Oubril that he would like authorization, as soon as the Prussian troops were ready to act, to cross the border and re-occupy in the emperor's name the frontier posts from which the Russians had been driven. Prussian operations, for the moment, he said, would be limited to this occupation: if more important action was necessary, a further agreement would be required.¹⁷ To this request the Russian government promptly assented, out of concern for the fate of its custom-houses.¹⁸

¹⁶ The contents of the Alvensleben Convention are accurately summarized by Sybel, *op. cit.*, II, 507-508. The exact text has never been published, to the best of my knowledge, except in the rather rare work of Lutostanski, *Les Partages de la Pologne et la Lutte pour l'Indépendance* (Paris, 1918), pp. 598-599.

¹⁷ Oubril to Gorchakov, Jan. 27/Feb. 8, Tg. no. 21.

¹⁸ Gorchakov to Oubril, Jan. 28/Feb. 9, Tg. no. 51.

But immediately afterward it became apparent that Bismarck was contemplating action on a larger scale and of a much more serious nature. From February 9 on, the inspired Berlin press began to talk more and more ominously of the "impending intervention" in Poland, of the theoretical and practical justification for it, of the salutary effects that would follow from the first shot fired by the Prussian troops, and of how desirable it was in the interests of the Poles themselves to end the rising speedily.¹⁹ Bismarck himself talked in the same strain. His language to Oubril grew clearer and clearer. The essential thing, he said, for the interests of Russia and Prussia alike, was to finish quickly with the rebellion before the great revolutionary movement announced for the month of March. "We desire you to understand clearly that we demand the authorization to enter your territory." The Prussians would be ready to cross the frontier within a few days. He (Bismarck) and Roon were for an immediate action on the line Thorn-Myslowice, while the king inclined to strike further to the east.²⁰ Still more significant were Bismarck's declarations to other persons. In a conversation with Sir Andrew Buchanan, the British envoy at Berlin, on February 11, he avowed that Russia and Prussia had concluded a convention for the joint repression of the rebellion and declared that, in case the Russians should be driven out of Poland, Prussia would occupy the country in order to prevent the rise of a power incurably hostile to herself.²¹ Five days later he talked only too freely on the subject to Behrend, a deputy to the Landtag from Danzig, in a conversation which in somewhat varied versions promptly made the rounds of the newspapers and the diplomatic world and became for a while the sensation of Europe.²² On this occasion Bismarck declared that there were two possible lines of policy to be adopted toward Poland: either Prussia might come quickly to the aid of Russia, before the

¹⁹ From Feb. 9 down to about the eighteenth, the Berlin newspapers were full of rumors and discussions on these subjects.

²⁰ Oubril's despatches of Feb. 8-12, *passim*.

²¹ Sybel, *op. cit.*, II. 508; Buchanan's report of Feb. 14, Lutostański, *op. cit.*, pp. 599-600.

²² The "Behrend conversation" took place, not at a ball, as has often been said, but in Bismarck's office, where the deputy from Danzig had come in the interests of his constituents to protest against any intervention in Poland (Oubril's report of Feb. 10/22, no. 48). The date, which has never hitherto been given, can be fixed with approximate certainty as Feb. 16, from a despatch of that day to the *Pester Lloyd*, cited in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* of Feb. 21. Apart from the newspapers, the usual sources for the episode are: Poschinger, *Fürst Bismarck und die Parlamentarier*, II. 24-25; Bernhardi, *op. cit.*, V. 33; Klaczko, "Deux Négociations", *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Sept. 15, 1864, p. 335. I have followed especially Oubril's reports, nos. 48 and 55, of Feb. 10/22 and 14/26.

Western Powers were able to interfere; or she might wait until the Russians were driven out or voluntarily abandoned Poland, in which case she must then promptly occupy the country on her own behalf and reorganize it in her own interest, perhaps as a kingdom bound to herself by a personal union. This second contingency was all the more likely to occur, and the plan proposed to meet it was the more practicable, because Russia was tired of the impossible task of holding down Poland: Emperor Alexander had told him so during his stay in St. Petersburg and had suggested that the more civilized Germans might succeed where the Russians had failed.

Even before this astonishing indiscretion, Oubril had been seized with suspicions as to the disquieting designs of Russia's ally. Only three days after the Convention was signed, he wrote to Gorchakov: "Everything leads me to believe that they desire here to come to a complete and serious intervention. Does that conform to your intentions?" "The idea of the Prussian cabinet", he added on February 12, "is evidently to co-operate with us in the re-establishment of order in the kingdom." Prussia's extensive military preparations and the ideas prevailing in governmental and military circles clearly pointed to "a veritable intervention".²³

St. Petersburg quickly caught the alarm. Alexander, at the first symptom of danger, wrote: "I admit no other intervention than that which has been stipulated in writing."²⁴ With his assent Gorchakov promptly telegraphed that "our arrangement" had contemplated only that the troops of each power might pursue rebels across the frontier until they encountered troops of the other power strong enough to end the combat; that it was a question only of "guarantees for custom-houses and frontier posts". "To give to the intervention larger proportions would correspond neither with the needs of the moment nor with the relative power of the two courts with respect to the insurrection. Such an enlargement would be contrary to the views of the emperor."²⁵ For a week the discussion raged as to the true sense of the "Convention" and the proper limits of Prussia's co-operation. Then Prussia suddenly lost all inclination for active intervention as a result of events which her government had probably not foreseen and had certainly not desired.

It is difficult to acquit Bismarck of not a little bungling in connection with the "Convention". He began by making a great fan-

²³ Oubril to Gorchakov, Jan. 30/Feb. 11, Tg. no. 22. Oubril's reports, nos. 25 and 33, of Jan. 30/Feb. 11 and Jan. 31/Feb. 12.

²⁴ Marginal note on Oubril's telegram, no. 22, of Jan. 30/Feb. 11.

²⁵ Telegram to Oubril of Feb. 1/13, no. 60.

faronade in his newspapers. The world was given to understand that Prussia and Russia had just concluded an agreement about Poland of the utmost importance; that the Prussian troops were just about to march into that kingdom; that the cabinet of Berlin did not believe that the other powers would even dare to enter a protest. Having thus aroused the curiosity and the alarm of the public in Germany and western Europe, he insisted on making a mystery of the terms of the "Convention". His language to Buchanan and Talleyrand, the French envoy, on February 11, was also a tantalizing mixture of bravado and reticence. Had he either kept the whole affair a secret or, after allowing so much to be known about it, had he consented to publish the rather harmless text of the agreement, he might have spared himself much trouble and humiliation.²⁶

The first result of Bismarck's tactics was an unexampled storm of indignation throughout Prussia against this mysterious and odious "Convention". There followed those familiar scenes in the Prussian Diet (February 16-17 and 26-28), when Bismarck met with perhaps the fiercest parliamentary attacks of his career and, while still obstinately refusing to disclose the scope of the "Convention", defended himself chiefly by insulting the Chamber and its president.

Still worse was the menacing attitude suddenly assumed by France. Napoleon III., the official champion of nationalities in distress, had hitherto tried to maintain his entente with Russia by affirming that the Polish insurrection was a Russian domestic problem and would remain so as long as no foreign powers took a hand in it. The Alvensleben Convention destroyed the basis of this policy. If a reactionary power like Prussia could intervene against the Poles, ought not a liberal power like France to intervene on their behalf? Still clinging to his old friendship for Russia, Napoleon decided to interfere, but only against Prussia, the arch-culprit in the transaction. From February 15 onward, the news that reached Berlin from Paris grew more and more ominous. Napoleon's foreign minister, Drouyn de Lhuys, raised his tone daily, until he reached the point of telling Goltz, the Prussian envoy, that only Bismarck's dismissal could restore good relations.²⁷ On the twenty-first he proposed to England and Austria that the three powers should send identical notes of protest to Berlin. The Russian and Prussian envoys reported that

²⁶ Sybel throws the whole blame for revealing the Convention to the world upon Gorchakov, who does appear on Feb. 9 to have initiated the French ambassador into the secret. But Sybel ignores the fact that on the same day, and doubtless at Bismarck's instigation, the Berlin newspapers began to trumpet the affair forth to Europe.

²⁷ Sybel, *op. cit.*, II, 512.

the situation had become very grave; the atmosphere in Paris resembled that before the war of 1859; it was to be feared that France would take her revenge for the Polish affair by striking a blow on the Rhine.²⁸

It is not easy to trace all the repercussions of these developments at Berlin; but it is fairly clear that Bismarck did not meet the crisis with quite that degree of self-confidence and unwavering firmness that Sybel's account suggests. Already about February 16 he began to draw in his horns. The Berlin newspapers ceased talking of intervention and commenced to say that the Prussian troops would now have no occasion to act outside their frontiers. "Diplomatic circles", it was said, "now regard Bismarck's plans for intervention and occupation as completely collapsed."²⁹ The British envoy, to whom "on previous occasions he [Bismarck] always spoke of the probability of the Russian army in Poland proving too weak to suppress the insurrection", now found him taking the opposite tone.³⁰ Beginning on February 20, for a week the Prussian capital was filled with rumors of a ministerial crisis. Bernhardi wrote in his diary: "Everybody regards Bismarck's government as at an end, and is convinced that he can no longer maintain himself."³¹ Indeed, it is almost certain that, as a result of the storm of opposition at home and abroad to the Alvensleben Convention and the vehement attacks made upon it even in the Prussian cabinet, Bismarck did, presumably on February 23, tender his resignation, which the king however refused to accept.³²

But the strangest phenomenon of these troubled weeks was a new series of dissensions between Russia and Prussia. These discords have usually been ascribed solely to Gorchakov's alleged desire to annul the "Convention" while throwing the blame for doing so upon Bismarck; but in the light of the Russian documents it would seem that the case was nearly the contrary.

The misunderstanding started on the twenty-second, at a conference between Bismarck and Oubril. Both men were gravely disquieted by the news from Paris. Bismarck apparently began by saying that under the circumstances "it seemed urgent to limit Prussia's action to the surveillance of her own frontiers, without even partial co-operation outside of Prussian territory". This involved of course

²⁸ Oubril to Gorchakov, Feb. 10/22, no. 46.

²⁹ Berlin despatch of Feb. 19, in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* (Leipzig) of Feb. 21.

³⁰ Buchanan's report of Feb. 21, *Parliamentary Papers*, 1863, LXXV.

³¹ Feb. 25; Bernhardi, *op. cit.*, V. 37.

³² *Ibid.*; *Memoirs and Letters of Sir Robert Morier*, I. 304-305; *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, Mar. 4, 1863; Philippson, *Max von Förckenbeck*, p. 112.

the renunciation, not only of the operations agreed upon two weeks before for the recovery of the Russian custom-houses and frontier posts, but also of any really effective application of the "Convention". That "Convention" still subsisted, Bismarck affirmed; "but", he said, "it is clear that you will not wish, by insisting upon its execution, to lead France to throw an observation corps on our western frontier". Oubril was the more disposed to acquiesce because he had just received a telegram from Gorchakov declaring that in view of the better news from Poland he hoped and foresaw that the necessity for applying the measures agreed upon (the occupation of the frontier posts by Prussia) would not arise.³³ Hence the Russian envoy readily agreed that the "arrangement" should be reduced to its original character as a measure for policing the frontiers and that no Prussian troops should cross the border.³⁴ Bismarck hastened to inform Paris of this decision and to instruct General Werder in Posen accordingly.

The episode aroused mixed impressions at St. Petersburg. Not without a touch of malicious pleasure, Gorchakov reported to the emperor that he was not surprised that Bismarck now sought to back out of their agreement: besides, the latter's ministerial existence was now in peril. Alexander regretfully agreed to abandon the "arrangement", "since Prussia wished it".³⁵

Immediately afterward, however, news arrived that King William and Bismarck were now ascribing to Russia the initiative in proposing the suspension of the "Convention". Gorchakov promptly and quite correctly retorted that Russia had done no more than express the hope that Prussian aid would not be needed, while Bismarck had proposed that no aid should be given whether it were needed or not—which was something very different.³⁶ While this dispute was raging as to what had really happened on February 22, a new incident occurred at Berlin to aggravate the misunderstanding.

February 27 was the day when the news from the western capitals was at its worst. Interpellations to Prussia of a more or less complimentary nature were expected from England, France, and Austria, and there was no telling what further action might follow these notes. If one may believe the Russian envoy, "anguish" reigned at Berlin. Calling upon Bismarck that morning, Oubril found him engaged in

³³ Telegram to Oubril of Feb. 9/21, no. 87.

³⁴ Oubril's report, no. 46, of Feb. 10/22; unnumbered telegram (copy) of the same date.

³⁵ Gorchakov to Alexander, Feb. 11/23. Alexander's reply, and marginal note on Oubril's telegram of Feb. 10/22.

³⁶ Gorchakov to Oubril, telegram no. 99, Feb. 13/25.

persuading Sir Andrew Buchanan that the famous "Convention" had never been more than a still-born project, because, as he said, it had never been ratified and the negotiations for putting it into force had been suspended by common accord, in view of the improved military situation in Poland. Oubril was called upon to confirm these prevarications. Taken by surprise and unwilling to inflict a *démenti* upon his friend, the envoy could only corroborate what Bismarck had said, although he recognized that the British government was hardly likely to be deceived by such statements about an agreement whose form and text showed that no ratification was ever needed or intended. After Buchanan's departure, Bismarck, "evidently alarmed by the news from Count Goltz and shaken by the difficulties of the internal situation", as Oubril reported, "pointed out that the demands of the three courts were to be addressed to Prussia alone, whose position might thus at any moment become extremely grave. He intimated to me that it would therefore be an act of generosity, if the emperor would free Prussia from this predicament by renouncing an arrangement which everywhere encountered so lively an opposition." He put the question flatly: "Do you want the maintenance of the Convention, and in that case probably war with France, Austria, and perhaps England—or its abolition?" Nevertheless the end of the discussion was more in the Bismarck manner: "Prussia would be firm, if she were sure of Russian aid; but she hesitated, not knowing whether Russia was determined and able to accept the struggle."³⁷

This time Gorchakov triumphed. He at once telegraphed back: "Since Prussia judges it to her interest to renounce the arrangement, the emperor will not oppose."³⁸ In a private letter to Oubril he further explained: "The emperor agrees that the Alvensleben arrangement should be considered *non avenu*. I have never ascribed to this act any practical importance, without denying its moral value. They have been very clumsy at the place where you are . . . but I cannot bear to indulge in any recriminations, for I am in such despair over the humiliation of our friend Bismarck." Russia had not felt able to assume the initiative in renouncing the "arrangement" at the dictation of foreign powers. "In spite of all our desire to facilitate the task of the Berlin cabinet", Gorchakov wrote, "we could not make this sacrifice of our dignity. The emperor would never have consented to it. The situation is very grave, I admit."³⁹ As for the

³⁷ Oubril to Gorchakov, Feb. 17/Mar. 1, report no. 61; Oubril's telegram of Feb. 15/27, no. 58.

³⁸ Telegram to Oubril, Feb. 16/28, no. 102.

³⁹ Letter, approved by the emperor, of Feb. 16/28.

final appeal that Bismarck had made, Alexander wrote: "Aid for a war against France and England: no, thanks!"⁴⁰

Meanwhile, however, the horizon had quickly begun to clear. Within a day or so it became fairly certain that neither England nor Austria would join France in a *démarche* against Prussia. Bismarck's tone rose at once. Soon he was denying that he had ever asked for, or even hinted at, the abrogation of the "Convention". Indeed, he said, he was much opposed to making any such unnecessary and undignified concession to the Western Powers. He proposed rather that Russia should join him in declaring that the "Convention" had never been put into force, the negotiations for that purpose having been halted in view of the favorable turn of events in Poland. Gorchakov and Oubril dissented warmly from their ally's version of what had happened and had no taste for this disingenuous effort to mollify the Western Powers. For a while the two cabinets still wrangled and recriminated. But by the first week in March it was evident that no serious interpellations over the "Convention" were to be apprehended. The Western Powers, having at last come into possession of the very innocuous text of this agreement, had lost all interest in it; and England was now absorbed in drawing her confederates into a diplomatic campaign against, not Prussia, but Russia. The cabinet of St. Petersburg, finding itself thus menaced, was not disposed to uphold an agreement which had hitherto led only to polemics with its ally and protests from its enemies. Bismarck, having burned his fingers once in this Polish affair, was not inclined to renew the experiment. Hence from early March onward, by a kind of general tacit agreement, the Alvensleben Convention was consigned to oblivion.

IV.

After this review of the history of the "Convention", it remains to consider the significance of this short-lived agreement, and especially to examine the motives that led Bismarck into it and the results that he attained.

It may be remarked at the outset that the "Convention" was almost unanimously condemned by contemporaries⁴¹ and that while, after Bismarck's astonishing successes began, the public was disposed to look back with more respect upon his early diplomatic manoeuvres,

⁴⁰ Marginal comment on Oubril's report, no. 61.

⁴¹ Cf., e.g., Treitschke's remarks of that time on "die Thorheiten des Herrn von Bismarck" (*Heinrich von Treitschke, Briefe*, ed. Max. Cornelius, II, 256-257); and Duncker's regrets over Bismarck's "Étourderies für Russland" (Haym, *Max Duncker*, p. 286).

still for about twenty years scarcely any writer had more than the vaguest ideas either as to why the "Convention" was made or what it might be supposed to have accomplished. It was only after Bismarck's version of the affair came out through the inspired publications of Eckardt,⁴² Busch,⁴³ and Heinrich von Sybel,⁴⁴ and through his own memoirs, conversations, and parliamentary speeches, that the Alvensleben Convention began to be regarded as a master-stroke of policy—a view which almost all historians have echoed for the past thirty years.

In the *Gedanken und Erinnerungen* Bismarck presents the "Convention" as a highly successful effort to prevent a Russo-Polish reconciliation, which would have had disastrous consequences for the security of Prussia's eastern provinces and for her future relations with Russia. He relates how during his stay at St. Petersburg as envoy in 1861–1862 he had watched the struggle there between two parties: the one pro-Polish, Francophile, Panslavist, anti-German, represented by Gorchakov, the Grand Duke Constantine, the Marquis Wielopolski, and many other influential people; and the other party, which clung to the older policy of solidarity with Prussia and repression of Polish national aspirations—the tendency represented by the emperor, the military men, and the German nobility in Russia. The issue seemed dubious, as no full reliance could be placed on Alexander, who was tired of trying to hold down Poland by force and inclined at times to give up most of that country altogether. In this contest the Prussian government was then able to turn the scales by winning over the tsar to the Alvensleben Convention, which committed him to a policy of rigorous repression in Poland and to the renunciation of any idea of a fraternal reconciliation with the Poles against the Germans. There was no military need for the "Convention", as the Russian troops were strong enough to handle the situation. The agreement had simply a diplomatic aim.

It represented a victory won in the cabinet of the Russian emperor by Prussian policy over the pro-Polish one. . . . An agreement of a political-military nature, concluded by Russia with the Germanic enemy of Panslavism against the Polish "brother race", was a decisive blow to the prospects of the Polonizing party at the Russian court; and in this sense the arrangement—rather anodyne in a military way—richly attained its purpose. . . . The Convention was a successful move on the chessboard, which decided the game.⁴⁵

⁴² In the anonymous work, *Berlin und Petersburg* (1880).

⁴³ *Unser Reichskanzler* (1884).

⁴⁴ *Op. cit.*, first edition, of 1889–1894.

⁴⁵ *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, I. 306–315. Cf. Bismarck's speech in the Reichstag, Jan. 28, 1886, in Kohl, *Bismarck's Politische Reden*, XI. 419–420.

Sybel has emphasized another side of the affair. He presents as the chief aim of Bismarck's policy an object which the latter merely alludes to: the desire to avert an apparently imminent Franco-Russian alliance, which might have opposed great obstacles to the realization of Prussia's German ambitions. In this sense too, we are told, the "Convention" was a complete success. By boldly taking up his stand at the side of Russia at a moment when he foresaw that Napoleon would adopt the contrary course, Bismarck showed the tsar where his true friends were and made sure that, in contrast to the tendencies hitherto prevalent on the Neva, Russian policy would henceforth cleave, not to France, but to Prussia.⁴⁶

For Moritz Busch, Bismarck's chief object was to secure the gratitude of Russia, "that Prussia's great eastern neighbor should look with a favorable eye upon his future undertakings in Germany".⁴⁷ Some other writers have suggested that in making the "Convention" Bismarck was thinking, not so much of the future, as of the immediate danger that the Polish insurrection might succeed unless Prussia joined actively in suppressing it.⁴⁸ Finally, it has sometimes been conjectured that he was seeking a chance to occupy "Congress Poland" and keep it for Prussia—not so much perhaps out of mere lust for territory as from a desire to take over into his more capable hands that task of exterminating Polish nationalism to which the Russians had shown themselves so unequal.⁴⁹

Three of these five explanations—the three that emanate from Bismarck himself or from writers inspired by him—do appear to find some confirmation in his correspondence from St. Petersburg in 1861 and 1862.⁵⁰ Undoubtedly he was at that time gravely disquieted by the growing disturbances in Congress Poland, the conciliatory and yielding policy adopted by the Russian government, the strength of the pro-Polish party on the Neva, the reforms inaugurated at Warsaw by the Grand Duke Constantine and Wielopolski. He did view with concern the progress of the Franco-Russian entente, and he saw that Prussia enjoyed no great prestige or popularity with the Russian public. Nevertheless, he remained convinced that, as long as Alexander II. reigned, it was unthinkable that Russia should ever adopt

⁴⁶ *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, II. 500 ff.

⁴⁷ *Unser Reichskanzler*, II. 151.

⁴⁸ This is the explanation, e.g., of Ollivier, *L'Empire Libéral*, VI. 117–118.

⁴⁹ Klaeckzo, *Deux Chancelliers*, p. 183. Koźmian, *Das Jahr 1863*, p. 93. Mather, *Bismarck*, II. 76–77.

⁵⁰ Recently published in part by Raschdau, *Die Politischen Berichte des Fürsten Bismarck aus Petersburg und Paris*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1920).

a policy hostile to Prussia.⁵¹ The tsar and his uncle, King William, continued to maintain more intimate relations than any other two monarchs in Europe; the Prussian envoy enjoyed a more privileged position than any other foreign representative at St. Petersburg; and, apart from the Polish question, there was no very dark cloud upon the horizon.

Even while admitting that during his sojourn at St. Petersburg Bismarck may have meditated much on the future of Russo-Prussian and Franco-Russian relations and on the need of insuring the tsar's support for contests that were to come, the fact remains that in the documents contemporary with the Alvensleben Convention, in his utterances of late January and the first half of February, 1863, there is scarcely an allusion to any such far-sighted calculations, to any contingencies of the future. His attention seems centred wholly on the immediate peril and the need of immediate Prussian action. He appears to have been actuated chiefly by two ideas: first, he doubted whether Russia was seriously determined to suppress the insurrection, rather than yield to it or compromise with it; and, secondly, he doubted whether, even with the best of intentions, she would be able to crush the Poles, or at least to do so promptly enough to forestall an intervention by the Western Powers, unless Prussia at once came actively to her assistance. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that at the outset the higher circles in Berlin greatly exaggerated the strength of the uprising, the military weakness of Russia,⁵² and above all the tsar's assumed readiness to rid himself of Poland and to yield to armed rebels.⁵³ Hence Bismarck's pointed insinuation to Oubril that he was ignorant whether Russia intended unswervingly to put down the insurrection;⁵⁴ his admonitions that without a thorough change of policy in Poland peace and order would never be assured;⁵⁵

⁵¹ Bismarck to Bernstorff, Raschdau, II. 161. The preceding statements are based on passages in this correspondence too numerous to mention.

⁵² Gorchakov to the emperor, Jan. 12/24: "Le comte Redern est venu très ému m'apporter un télégramme de Bismarck rempli d'exagérations sur les événements du royaume"; Oubril to Gorchakov, Jan. 22/Feb. 3 (private letter); Bernhardi, *op. cit.*, V. 22 ff.; Sybel, *op. cit.*, II. 509.

⁵³ Bismarck expressed the idea that Russia might decide to abandon Poland, to Behrend on Feb. 16 and to Oubril himself a few days later (the latter's report, no. 48, Feb. 10/22). Cf. also his remarks to Talleyrand, in Ollivier, *op. cit.*, VI. 116-117.

⁵⁴ Oubril reported Jan. 28/Feb. 9 (no. 23) that Bismarck had told him: "qu'ils ignoraient si une résistance d'outrance était dans les vues du Gouvernement de Varsovie. Mr. de Bismarck m'a confié ce fait avec une impression qui ne m'a pas échappé." Alexander underlined the first sentence and commented: "C'est par trop fort."

⁵⁵ Oubril's report of Feb. 10/22, no. 50.

hence, above all, his desire for an immediate armed Prussian intervention. We have already seen how he strove to pave the way for such action by his talks with Oubril, Behrend, and Sir Andrew Buchanan, and by premonitory rumblings in his newspapers. To Max Duncker, the crown prince's adviser, he confided that "they must prepare very quietly, place an army on the frontier ready to strike, and then, if the moment for action arrived, make a tiger's leap, in order that the suppression of the Polish uprising might be a *fait accompli* before the Western Powers could intervene".⁵⁶ His concentration of half the Prussian army on the eastern frontier, a force far greater than was required for purely defensive purposes, was a further revelation of the project which chiefly occupied his mind, it would seem, during the eight or ten days after the "Convention" was signed.

It does not seem likely that Bismarck, in planning this intervention, was actuated primarily by thirst for Polish territory, the desire to lay hands on booty that he might ultimately hope to keep, although this was suspected at the time by the Russians and has since been asserted by various writers.⁵⁷ But he undoubtedly considered very seriously the possibility that the tsar would decide either to abandon Poland to itself as a more or less independent state or else to hand over the wearisome burden of governing the country to his ally at

⁵⁶ Feb. 19, 1863; Bernhardi, *op. cit.*, V. 34-35.

⁵⁷ Oubril, reporting (no. 48, Feb. 10/22) Bismarck's indiscretions to Behrend—that Bismarck was charged with saying that the Convention gave Prussia the opportunity to seize Poland as far as the Vistula, at least, and to organize it as a kingdom bound to herself by a personal union, etc.—commented: "Ces déclarations ne doivent pas nous engager à prêter à cette transaction [the Convention] une plus grande portée qu'il n'était pas dans notre pensée de lui donner primitivement." Alexander commented: "Non, certes."

For the usual tales about Bismarck's lust for Polish territory, see Koźmian, *Das Jahr 1863*, p. 93 ("Die Occupation Polens und dessen Anschluss an Preussen gehörte zu seinen sehnlichsten Wünschen") and Klaczko, *Deux Chancelliers*, p. 183. Most of the stories here adduced have been refuted: cf. *Berlin und Petersburg*, pp. 85 ff.

It is true that since 1815 some people in Prussia, particularly military men, have occasionally talked of the need of gaining for strategic reasons a better frontier on the east, such as the frontier of 1795 or the "Knesebeck line" of 1813. Bismarck himself once declared in private conversation that he would not refuse some accession of Polish territory that would better protect Silesia against Russian attack (Sept. 25, 1876; Lucius von Ballhausen, *Bismarck-Erinnerungen*, p. 91). As soon as the Prussian Zollverein was founded, the Berlin government suggested that Congress Poland should be taken into this purely German customs-union (1834, cf. Martens, *Recueil des Traités . . . conclus par la Russie*, VIII. 242); and it is rather curious to see Bismarck hazarding this same suggestion not long after the Alvensleben Convention (Oubril's report, no. 129, of Mar. 29/Apr. 10, 1863).

Berlin.⁵⁸ The presence of Prussian troops in Poland would give Bismarck the means of thwarting the first plan or of realizing the second, if that should be necessary. But his primary object apparently, both in making the "Convention" and in planning active intervention, was to gain the right, as an ally, both to exert a more direct and potent influence upon Russia's Polish policy and to render active assistance in suppressing the uprising before the Western Powers could interfere.

We have seen that within two weeks Bismarck had to renounce all thought of sending Prussian troops into Poland, and that within four weeks the "Convention" itself had become what he himself called a "dead letter".⁵⁹ He then fell back upon those versions of the affair which, in more or less elaborated form, he was to put forth for the rest of his life. He began to claim that by this agreement, which had already fulfilled its purpose the moment it was signed, he had won the gratitude of Russia;⁶⁰ he had averted an imminent alliance between Russia and France;⁶¹ he had defeated the pro-Polish party in the cabinet of the Russian emperor.⁶²

⁵⁸ Bismarck insisted strongly both at that time and later in his memoirs that Alexander thought seriously of abandoning Poland and had told him so in plain words during his sojourn at St. Petersburg. Apart from Bismarck's own testimony, I believe we have no evidence that Alexander ever cherished such ideas. It is known that Nicholas I. on various occasions thought of handing over the land west of the Vistula to Prussia or Austria; see Schiemann, *Geschichte Russlands unter Kaiser Nikolaus I.*, III. 119-120, IV. 90-91. Oubril wrote, Mar. 17/29 (no. 105): "Dans nos rapports avec le chef actuel du Cabinet prussien nous ne devons jamais perdre de vue qu'il est constamment pénétré de l'idée que S. M. l'Empereur et Son Gouvernement ne seraient pas éloignés de faire bon marché de la Pologne. Mes assurances positives à cet égard l'ont ébranlé, mais sans le guérir radicalement."

⁵⁹ Sybel, *op. cit.*, II. 515.

⁶⁰ This claim appears already in his letter to the king of Feb. 20, 1863 (*Gedanken und Erinnerungen, Anhang*, I. 52): "Wie die Sachen in Polen sich zu gestalten scheinen, werden wir dort zu einer thätigen Mitwirkung kaum berufen werden, und haben dann durch die Convention den Vortheil, uns für die Zukunft die Dankbarkeit des Kaisers Alexander und die russische Sympathie wohlfeil gesichert zu haben."

⁶¹ May 5, 1863, the Saxon envoy at Berlin wrote to his government that Bismarck had told him that at the beginning of February "Alexander II. sei im Begriff gewesen, dem Drängen des Grossfürsten Konstantin und Gortschakows nachgebend, ein Bündnis mit Frankreich auf Grundlage der Unabhängigkeit Polens einzugehen. Um dies zu verhindern, habe Preussen sich beeilt, die Konvention abzuschliessen." Hassel, *König Albert von Sachsen*, II. 132-133. (This story is surely a great exaggeration on the part either of Bismarck or of the Saxon envoy.)

⁶² He told Keudell, May 26, 1863: "Dieselbe [the Convention] hat bewirkt, dass die Polenfreunde in Petersburg nicht zur Geltung kamen." (Keudell, *Fürst und Fürstin Bismarck*, pp. 120-121.) Cf. his language to Bernstorff, Mar. 9, 1863 (meant for English consumption): "Dort [St. Petersburg] ist die polenfreundliche Partei mit Gortschakow und Wielopolski an der Spitze . . . zugleich die

Among these three claims the last is the most questionable, and yet it is the one that Bismarck chiefly emphasized in his memoirs. Apart from his own statements, there seems to be no real evidence that the "Convention" had any essential, or even perceptible, effect on Russia's policy toward Poland. Before the "Convention" and for some time afterward, Alexander II. does not appear to have wavered in his determination both to repress the insurrection and, when that had been accomplished, to continue on the path of reforms. It is true that this second part of the programme was gradually abandoned between April and August of 1863.⁶³ The appointment in April of Muraviev, "the hangman", as governor general at Wilno, the resignation of Wielopolski in July, and the final departure of the Grand Duke Constantine from Warsaw in September were the chief outward signs that the effort at Russo-Polish reconciliation had collapsed. The reasons are familiar to those who have studied Russia's internal history at that time. It was, on the one hand, the spreading of the revolt to Lithuania, White Russia, and the Ukraine—thus menacing what the Russian public considered "true Russian lands"—and, on the other hand, the diplomatic campaign started by the Western Powers that led to that formidable outburst of public opinion against the Poles and their foreign protectors, which forced the government to reverse its Polish policy.⁶⁴ The Alvensleben Convention had nothing to do with the change. It was not in any real sense "the move that decided the game".

It is difficult also to repress a doubt as to how far that "Convention" won the gratitude of Russia. As far as Gorchakov and a good part of the Russian diplomats were concerned, there can scarcely be any talk of gratitude. They regarded the agreement as unnecessary and rather humiliating.⁶⁵ Alexander probably welcomed the "arrangement", but it is hard to see that it made any notable change in

Partei Frankreichs und des ehrgeizigen Russlands mit orientalischen Plänen. . . . Durch den Abschluss unserer Konvention, die unter grossem Widerstreben Gortschakows erfolgte, auf bestimmten Befehl des Kaisers, verschaffen wir, so viel an uns lag, der anti-polnischen und anti-französischen Partei im Kabinett des Kaisers die Oberhand." (*Bismarck-Jahrbuch*, VI. 172–173.)

⁶³ See especially A. A. Kornilov, *Russkaia Politika v Polskie*, pp. 64–65.

⁶⁴ See M. N. Muraviev's Memoirs (*Zapiski*) in the *Russkaia Starina*, XXXVI. (1882) 389–390; Schedo-Ferrotti, *Etudes sur l'Avenir de la Russie*, VIII. 101–102, 112; [Eckardt], *Berlin und Petersburg*, p. 71, etc.

⁶⁵ Sybel, *op. cit.*, II. 508; Ollivier, *op. cit.*, VI. 118, note (Balabin, the Russian envoy at Vienna, told Gramont: "Le concours de la Prusse [est] inutile comme fait de guerre et très regrettable comme acte diplomatique"); Bernhardi, *op. cit.*, V. 32 (as to the attitude of the Russian officials in Warsaw: "Die Leute da wollen weder unsern Rath noch unsern Beistand").

his attitude. He had always been devoted to Prussia and to his royal uncle, anyway. The ensuing month was filled with misunderstandings, wranglings, and recriminations between the two courts over the meaning, application, or abrogation of the "Convention", in the midst of which one encounters in the Russian documents plenty of harsh words about Prussia and scarcely a hint of any sense of being under obligations to her. When in early March the agreement was virtually annulled, no elegies were pronounced over it. As for Bismarck personally, the man who claimed to have enchain'd the gratitude of Russia, Gorchakov expressed his anxiety that "Bismarck's *bévues* should not impair the intimate union between the two Courts";⁶⁶ and Alexander wrote, "One must admit that our dear Bismarck is a terrible blunderer".⁶⁷ Nevertheless, in this case also, later events altered the situation. The general diplomatic crusade which the Western Powers attempted to organize against Russia placed the tsar's government, from April onward, in a terribly embarrassed situation. By refusing to join in this campaign and by occasional half-promises that if war broke out Prussia would take the side of her menaced ally, Bismarck did to a certain extent win the gratitude of Russia and consolidate the entente between the two countries. It was by his conduct during the spring and summer of 1863, far more than by the Alvensleben Convention, that he gained this result.

Similar qualifications must be made regarding the third merit which is claimed for the "Convention": that of having ruined the prospects for a Franco-Russian alliance. Bismarck may indeed receive credit for having foreseen to some extent the errors into which France would fall, and for having therefore hastened to adopt a policy toward Russia that would shine by contrast. The "Convention" also did, as a matter of fact, serve as the occasion for Napoleon's first deviation from the correct and cautious attitude he had hitherto maintained. But in the last analysis it seems clear that the disastrous policy finally adopted by France in the Polish question—that policy which ruined her relations with Russia, drove the latter into the arms of Prussia, and made the crisis of 1863 so profitable for Bismarck—must be ascribed less to Bismarck's cleverness than to the conduct of England and Austria, who first led Napoleon on and then left him in the lurch.

⁶⁶ Letter to Oubril of Mar. 4/16. Gorchakov's and Oubril's correspondence is studded with sarcasms and complaints about Bismarck—his rashness, his indiscretions, his mendacity, his fantastic desire to play the part of Frederick the Great, etc.

⁶⁷ Marginal comment on Oubril's letter to Gorchakov of Feb. 10/22.

V.

In his celebrated speech of February 6, 1888, in the Reichstag, and much more fully in his memoirs, Bismarck revealed to an astonished public how narrowly Europe in the summer of 1863 had escaped a great general war, thanks to the moderation and self-restraint of Prussia.⁶⁸ He declared that at the time when he and King William were staying at Gastein (July 21-August 15), a long letter arrived from Alexander II, announcing that, wearied of the chicaneries of the Western Powers and Austria over the Polish question, he had decided to end it by drawing the sword, and appealed to the king to join him in doing so. This proposal was a sore temptation. It offered Bismarck a chance to free himself from the miseries of the constitutional conflict at home; and, since Russia was fully armed and Prussia could quickly become so, the two powers could almost certainly have crushed unsuspecting Austria before France could come to her assistance. But Bismarck also reflected that after the victory Russia would probably be averse to allowing Prussia to establish her hegemony in Germany. At any rate the German problem ought not to be settled with foreign aid, least of all with that of Russia, a country so unpopular with the German public. Hence he persuaded the king to refuse the offer in a long and very frank letter, in which Alexander was reminded that the proposed war would necessarily "condense itself" into a Franco-Prussian contest, in which Prussia would bear the chief burdens and wear herself out, while Russia would appear at the end, "on the long arm of the lever", to prescribe terms of peace just as at the Congress of Vienna. In his Reichstag speech, in particular, Bismarck plumed himself decidedly on this decision. "It required only a Yes instead of a No from His Majesty the King at Gastein," he declared, "and the great war, the coalition war, would have broken out already in 1863. Any other than a German minister would perhaps have assented to the proposal." And, amid the bravos of the assembly, he added that the public at home and abroad had no accurate conception of the degree of patriotism and conscientiousness which German monarchs and ministers brought to the government of their countries.

Unfortunately this picturesque tale is open to serious doubts and difficulties. Sybel was the first to undermine it. While in his first edition he had repeated substantially the same story,⁶⁹ in his fourth

⁶⁸ Kohl, *Bismarcks Politische Reden*, XII, 451-452; Bismarck, *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, I, 275, 311, II, 62 ff.

⁶⁹ Some striking divergencies, however, exist even between Sybel's first account and the *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*. For instance, the strangely frank argu-

edition, after having found the text of the tsar's letter and the king's reply, he gives a very different version. Alexander's letter is placed two months earlier (June 1). He is no longer represented as proposing an immediate offensive war, but rather as simply asking how far he could count upon Prussian aid, in case the Western Powers forced war upon him. And the king's reply in this version is so fundamentally different from that described by Bismarck that it is hard to believe that the two accounts refer to the same letter.⁷⁰ Hence the last writer on the subject (Lenz) has advanced the hypothesis that there were at that time two exchanges of letters between the two monarchs: the first, in June, as described by Sybel, and the second, during the Gastein sojourn, as described by Bismarck.⁷¹ Perhaps the question can be carried somewhat nearer to a solution in the light of documents which the present writer has used in the Russian archives.⁷²

The correspondence started with Alexander's letter of May 20/June 1. The emperor, while protesting his desire to maintain peace if it could honorably be done, declared that in view of the news from London and Paris he foresaw the likelihood that war would break out by the month of August. Hence, with a warm appeal to their old friendship and to the glorious fraternity of their two armies in 1813, he begged the king to tell him definitely in what degree and under what circumstances he could count upon the armed support of Prussia. He also begged his uncle to use his influence to detach Austria from the Western Powers and to build up again that conservative block of the three eastern courts which had proved so salutary fifty years before and was not less needed now.⁷³ King William replied (June 17) in a very negative and disappointing manner. In case of a French attack upon Russia, he could promise no more than a benevolent neutrality. For, he argued, if he were to join in the war without being attacked, he would appear to be an aggressor from the standpoint of German federal law; the Confederation and Assumptions which Bismarck claims to have put into William's letter to the tsar are presented by Sybel simply as arguments used by Bismarck in persuading the king.

⁷⁰ Sybel, *op. cit.*, fourth ed., II. 530 ff.

⁷¹ Max Lenz, "König Wilhelm und Bismarck in Gastein", in *Deutsche Rundschau*, CXXIX. (1906) 354-362.

⁷² The letters exchanged between William and Alexander in the summer of 1863 have been published in part in a small collection of essays by Baron B. E. Nolde, entitled *Unieshniia Politika* (Petrograd, 1915).

⁷³ This letter is very correctly summarized by Sybel except for the fact that, apparently from a desire to harmonize his later account with the earlier one, he seems to imply (II. 532, 541) that the idea of an unprovoked and unexpected attack on Austria emanated from the Russian side.

tria would then have an excuse for rendering no aid against a French invasion of Prussia. Moreover, the task of France would be facilitated if, instead of having to attack distant Russia, she could direct her blows to the Rhine-lands. For winning Austria away from her evil associates, he could suggest nothing better than a Russo-Prussian guaranty of Venetia (which he could be sure Alexander would never give), and a promise that Russia would never go back to the thought of a French alliance. And this singularly graceless letter ended with the suggestion that the Prussian public would be better disposed to an alliance with Russia if the tsar would grant greater facilities to Prussian commerce.

This reply practically ended the discussion of armed aid from Prussia. It is true that a month later (July 12)—at the height of the international crisis—Alexander wrote again, chiefly to urge redoubled efforts to win Austria over to the conservative cause. While questioning the possibility of Prussia's maintaining her neutrality if war broke out, he made little serious effort to reopen that question, and the whole tone of his letter was much cooler than on the previous occasion.

For another month the correspondence languished. The Polish crisis began to die away, while, on the other hand, Austria's sudden and theatrical effort to settle the German question through the Frankfort *Fürstentag* produced a grave state of tension in her relations with Prussia. Hence in King William's next letter to his nephew—written from Gastein on August 12—he seems to have dwelt almost wholly upon Austria's sensational and iniquitous conduct and upon Prussia's firm decision never to submit to the losses and humiliations that were being planned for her.⁷⁴ This resentful outburst evoked from Alexander only a reply in which, amid all expressions of sympathy, he pleaded for calm and moderation and for no decisions that would threaten the peace of Germany and thus serve the designs of the common enemy—Napoleon.⁷⁵

We are now in a position to resume the criticism of Bismarck's narrative. It seems clear that the effort to combine his version with

⁷⁴ The letter of Aug. 12 is the only one of the series which neither Baron Nolde nor I could find in the Russian archives. Sybel also evidently failed to find it at Berlin. The lack of it is the more regrettable because only if we had it could one judge with complete certainty of Bismarck's veracity in his statements about the letter written by William from Gastein. At any rate, the content of the letter can be gleaned from Alexander's reply of Sept. 11/23, in which he answers his uncle point by point. That King William wrote the tsar only one letter from Gastein—that of Aug. 12—seems to follow clearly from Oubril's letter to Gorchakov of Aug. 22/Sept. 3.

⁷⁵ Letter of Sept. 11/23.

that of Sybel's fourth edition can scarcely be maintained. There were, indeed, at that time two exchanges of letters between the monarchs, but the second exchange bears even less resemblance to what Bismarck describes than does the first, described by Sybel. One can only conclude that both in his Reichstag speech and in his later, fuller account the chancellor's memory served him very badly.⁷⁶ What he has given us seems to be a garbled, exaggerated, and dramatized version of the June episode. He has erred chronologically by transferring the incident to the Gastein period, perhaps because he dimly remembered that the two sovereigns had exchanged letters at that time. He has erred still more gravely as to the content of the correspondence. Alexander did not declare himself determined to draw the sword, propose an immediate offensive, or create a situation where a mere "Yes" from the King of Prussia would at once have unloosed a general war. And the king's reply was vastly less frank and open than, and in any case almost wholly different from, the answer that Bismarck professes to describe.⁷⁷

But it may be said that at all events the Russian overture did place Bismarck in a position where he had to weigh the chances of a Russo-Prussian contest with France and perhaps Austria; that the temptation to welcome such an eventual means of escape from his difficulties must have been very great; and that the reflections that passed through his mind and the arguments that he used with the king may well have been substantially those set forth in his memoirs. This is possible, but doubts arise particularly with regard to the point on which Bismarck has laid most stress—his alleged aversion to a war fought in alliance with Russia, his alleged conviction that the German question must be settled without foreign assistance.

Attention may be called in the first place to a later conversation between Oubril and Bismarck, in which the latter, referring back to the king's letter of June 17, declared that he and his colleagues in the ministry had been unanimous in urging that Prussia should promise armed support in case of a French attack on Russia, but that the king had judged otherwise.⁷⁸ This testimony might, however, be ques-

⁷⁶ Bismarck says in his memoirs, apropos of his draft for the king's reply to Alexander from Gastein: "Ich habe den Text meiner Argumentation nicht in der Erinnerung, obwohl ich ihn vor wenigen Jahren behufs unsrer Auseinandersetzung mit der russischen Politik [1888?] wieder unter Augen gehabt." *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, II. 65.

⁷⁷ Almost the only points in common are the negative character of the response and certain similarities in the arguments that Prussia's joining in the war would lead to complications from the standpoint of federal law and would turn the contest primarily into a Franco-Prussian struggle.

⁷⁸ Oubril to Gorchakov (private letter), Aug. 22/Sept. 3, 1863.

tioned on the ground that Bismarck at that moment was particularly anxious to ingratiate himself with Russia and all real danger of a war with France had passed.

But there are two clear cases in 1863 when Bismarck himself pleaded for the armed aid of Russia. The first occasion, already briefly touched upon in this article, was at the end of February, when, alarmed at the attitude of the Western Powers toward the Alvensleben Convention, he begged for assurances of Russian assistance in case of a French attack, in language that recalls Alexander's appeal of June.⁷⁹ The second and even less known occasion was in the following September. Bismarck at that time was in such a state of rage over the Frankfort *Fürstentag* that for a while he would talk to Oubril of nothing but war. If Russia would only join him, he professed himself convinced that they could easily strike down perfidious Austria by a brusque and unexpected attack, like that of Frederick the Great in 1756: *i.e.*, he proposed to Russia precisely that sudden offensive stroke against their adversaries which in his memoirs he erroneously declares that Russia had proposed to him. Oubril reported that "an encouragement on our part would have thrown him into the most hazardous adventures"—language which strangely recalls Bismarck's phrase about the effects of a Prussian "Yes" from Gastein. Alexander and his chancellor hastened to pour water upon the flames, for, as Gorchakov pointed out, after Prussia in June had offered Russia no more than her neutrality for what would have been a purely defensive war, Russia was now not going to commit herself for Prussia's sake to an aggressive war on Austria.⁸⁰ The whole episode suggests that Bismarck in 1863 had no such aversion on principle to a war fought in alliance with Russia as in his memoirs he claims to have had.

Nor can one be sure that Bismarck was at that time so disinclined as he later affirmed to free himself from internal difficulties by a foreign war. Among the arguments which he advanced to Oubril in favor of an attack on Austria, one was that "a war would help our domestic situation". And the Russian envoy reported at that time: "There is always one circumstance that frightens me: namely, Bis-

⁷⁹ "Pouvons-nous compter sur vous et irez-vous avec nous jusqu'au bout? . . . Si vous voulez marcher avec nous, nous devons en avoir l'assurance", etc. Oubril's reports, nos. 61 and 62 of Feb. 17/Mar. 1, and telegram, no. 58, of Feb. 15/27.

⁸⁰ Oubril's reports from Sept. 3 to Sept. 24 are full of Bismarck's talk and proposals as to a war with Austria. Alexander to William, Sept. 11/23; Gorchakov to Oubril, Aug. 26/Sept. 7, Sept. 11/23, 15/28.

marck's settled conviction that a war would facilitate and alleviate the position of the king's government at home."⁸¹

Hence I am inclined to hold that if Prussia in 1863 did not accept the tsar's proposal for a war alliance, the explanation is to be found, not so much in the patriotic, moral, or practical reasons that Bismarck alleges, but rather in the king's strong desire for peace.

VI.

From the foregoing study two conclusions of a broader nature may perhaps be drawn.

Bismarck's memoirs, composed at the end of his life, partly on the basis of documents but often on the basis of memory alone, constitute an historical source which, in spite of its indubitable value and engrossing interest, can be used only with the greatest caution, particularly with regard to the earlier periods of his career. Not until every portion of this work has been subjected to close critical examination shall we be able to realize how many distorted views or pure legends have been grafted into historical tradition by the *Ge-danken und Erinnerungen*.

Secondly, the world has been so much dazzled by Bismarck's triumphs of the later 'sixties and his long reign over the Continent after 1870 that we have been inclined to think of him as equally great at all times and on all occasions. In the early 'sixties not only the public at large but the diplomats who were in close contact with him had a very different impression. They considered him an inexperienced, reckless, flighty, erratic, harum-scarum sort of person. Doubtless they underestimated him, but have we not, with respect to that period, fallen a little into the opposite extreme? Are we not too much inclined to think that at the very beginning of his career as minister, Bismarck was already the consummate statesman that we know from later times, the perfect master in the field of international politics?

ROBERT H. LORD.

⁸¹ Oubril's report, no. 297, of Sept. 3/15 ("très-confidentielle"); and private letter ("secrète") to Gorchakov of the same date.

THE ODYSSEY OF THOMAS MUIR

IN 1796, Australia's only function was that of prison-house for the criminals of Great Britain. That Australia had any function at all was owing to the American War of Independence, since the loss to England of the American colonies involved the loss of any receptacle for the overflow from her jails. Till the year 1788 the Australian continent was left to itself, though the account of Captain Cook's voyage along the east coast had been published for fifteen years; but when pressure of criminal population in Great Britain became too great Australia suddenly acquired a practical value. In 1788 a penal settlement was formed on the site of Sydney, and at the period with which this article deals Sydney was still a penal settlement, and nothing more. It was not until some years later that Australia ceased to be simply a domestic necessity and became an object for political and imperial consideration. Its link with the great events of the day, the French Revolution and the political awakening of Great Britain, was simply the humble and unhappy one of serving as a prison for some of the unruly spirits that timid constitutionalism could not allow to go free.

Thomas Muir was a young Edinburgh advocate and a leading member of the Society of the Friends of the People, one of the numerous radical associations that sprang into being in 1792 as a result of the interest in political affairs lately awakened by the French Revolution. Most of the members of this society were small tradesmen, weavers, and other artisans, though some were professional men.¹ Its methods, like those of the parent society in London, were constitutional, and its object was to obtain "a full, fair, and equal representation of the People in Parliament, and a shorter duration of Parliamentary Delegation". Members declared their allegiance to the British Constitution, consisting of a King, House of Lords, and

NOTE. When the original manuscript of this article came to the editor, from Miss Marjorie Masson, of the University of Victoria, Australia, it appeared to him that the portion relating to Muir's adventures in America might well be more fully developed, by means of materials more easily accessible to a student working in Washington than to one working in Melbourne. He has accordingly amplified the story in this manner, and therefore the article, by Miss Masson's request, is published as a product of joint authorship. ED.

¹ Meikle, *Scotland and the French Revolution*, pp. 93, 106.

House of Commons, and promised to "discountenance and endeavour to suppress all sedition, riots, or disorder", and "to prevent any person from being admitted, or to remain a member of our Society, whose objects and designs may be unconstitutional".² But if the French Revolution stimulated the political aspirations of the artisan population, it also served to alarm the middle and governing classes. To Pitt and the Tory party, their imaginations inflamed by the acts in France, reform and revolution were interchangeable terms. They regarded with suspicion these earnest advocates of an extended suffrage, and none the less because the latter numbered among their friends the Whigs Fox, Grey, Sheridan, and Lauderdale;³ they considered these associations dangerous to good government and a menace to the monarchy, and stringent measures were taken to suppress them.

In the series of trials for sedition undertaken to this end, five of those which took place in Scotland ended in the transportation of the accused to Australia; and the first of the five was that of Muir. His trial took place in Edinburgh on August 30 and 31, 1793.⁴ It is not to modern eyes alone that the proceedings of those two days appear extraordinarily distorted and the conduct of the judges inhumanly vindictive. Romilly writes to a friend: "I am not surprised that you have been shocked at the account you have seen of Muir's trial; you would have been much more shocked if you had been present at it as I was."⁵ Cockburn records its injustice;⁶ Fox, Sheridan, and Grey tried to persuade the House of Commons of the wrong they were allowing,⁷ while Lauderdale told the House of Lords that "not one case in the whole history of Scottish criminal law stood upon record, either to justify, or even to countenance, the proceedings".⁸ Muir was tried before the notorious Lord Justice Clerk Braxfield and four other judges, and a jury composed of members of an association which had lately and openly condemned Muir and the Friends of the People.⁹ The charges against him were: exciting to sedition by inflammatory speeches, circulating Paine's *Rights of Man* and

² Home Office Papers, extract in Mitchell Library, Sydney. The Mitchell Library is a fine collection of printed and manuscript material bearing on the history, geography, etc., of Australasia.

³ The last three were the founders of the London Society of the Friends of the People. Meikle, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

⁴ Howell's *State Trials*, XXIII, 117 ff.

⁵ *Life of Sir Samuel Romilly*, I, 366.

⁶ Cockburn, *Examination of Trials for Sedition in Scotland*, pp. 144-183.

⁷ Hansard, Feb. 24, Mar. 10, 1794.

⁸ Hansard, Apr. 15, 1794.

⁹ The Goldsmith's Hall Association. *Trial of Muir*, p. 136.

other seditious writings, and reading and approving an address from the United Irishmen in a convention of Friends of the People assembled in Edinburgh. The last he admitted, though denying, and with reason, that it was seditious;¹⁰ but in spite of indisputable evidence to prove his innocence of the other charges, he was found guilty of all three. During the course of the trial, Muir said:

I admit that I exerted every effort to procure a more equal representation of the people in the House of Commons. If that be a crime, I plead guilty to the charge. I acknowledge that I considered the cause of parliamentary reform to be essential to the salvation of my country; but I deny that I ever advised the people to accomplish that great object by any means which the constitution did not sanction. I grant that I advised the people to read different publications upon both sides, which this great national question had excited, and I am not ashamed to assign my motives. I consider the ignorance of the people, on the one hand, to be the source from which despotism flows: I consider, upon the other hand, an ignorant people impressed with a sense of grievances, and wishing to have these grievances redressed, to be exposed to certain misery and complete ruin. Knowledge must always precede reformation, and who shall dare to say that the people shall be debarred from information, where it concerns them so materially? I am accused of sedition, and yet I can prove by thousands of witnesses, that I warned the people of the danger of that crime, exhorted them to adopt none but measures which were constitutional, and intreated them, to connect liberty with knowledge and both with morality.

One witness after another attested to Muir's constant exhortation to them to be peaceful in their methods, to confine themselves to seeking reform by means of petitioning Parliament: yet Dundas, the Lord Advocate, could speak of his "diabolical and mischievous conduct" and call him "the pest of Scotland"; while Braxfield clearly showed his scorn for all Muir's witnesses in the following speech: "Mr. Muir", he said,

might have known that no attention could be paid to such a rabble. What right had they to representation? He could have told them that the parliament would never listen to their petition. How could they think of it? A government in every country should be just like a corporation: and in this country, it is made up of the landed interest, which alone has a right to be represented: as for the rabble, who have nothing but personal property, what hold has the nation of them?

In considering the punishment to be awarded to Muir, one of the judges remarked that they had their choice of banishment, fine, whipping, imprisonment, and transportation. Reasons were found against them all (whipping he thought "too severe and disgraceful") except the last; another judge thought that there was no punishment adequate to the crime of sedition since torture was abolished; but all

¹⁰ The address is printed in Howell's *State Trials*, XXIII. 151-159.

concurred in thinking transportation the most suitable, and Muir was ordered to be transported beyond the sea for a period of fourteen years.¹¹

Muir's trial was followed by those of the Reverend T. F. Palmer, a former fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, and Unitarian minister of Dundee; William Skirving, a farmer and man of education, secretary of the Scottish Friends of the People; and Maurice Margarot and Joseph Gerald, London delegates to the British Convention of the Friends that met in Edinburgh in October–November, 1793. They were all sentenced to be transported. Neither the outcry at the injustice of the proceedings nor the protests made in Parliament could move the government from its determination to crush this inopportune and mistrusted spirit of reform.

On the first of May, 1794, the *Surprise*, convict transport, sailed from Spithead (St. Helen's) for Sydney, New South Wales, with Muir, Palmer, Skirving, and Margarot on board.¹² The French Admiralty, by order of the Comité du Salut Public, sent out frigates to attempt their rescue;¹³ but the *Surprise* sailed with a strong convoy of East Indiamen and some of His Majesty's ships, and it does not appear that they ever sighted the French frigates. The *Surprise* reached Sydney on October 25, 1794. "Ces infortunés furent jetés sur le plage désolé de Nouvelle Hollande [Australia], vaste sepulchre où le gouvernement britannique entasse indistinctement et les plus

¹¹ Muir writes from the Tolbooth Nov. 10, arrived in the Thames from Leith Dec. 1, 1793, and was put on board the *Surprise*, with others, handcuffed, two and two, Feb. 9, 1794. Rutt and Godwin visited him, in Newgate and in a prison-hulk. *Historical Records of New South Wales*, II, 826, 828; Palmer to Rutt, Feb. 10, in J. T. Rutt, *Life and Correspondence of Joseph Priestley*, II, 221; *ibid.*, p. 226.

¹² *The Trial of William Skirving* (Glasgow, 1836), p. 17. The fullest account of the voyage is in *A Narrative of the Sufferings of T. F. Palmer and W. Skirving during a Voyage to New South Wales* (Cambridge, 1797). There was a detention of a month at Rio de Janeiro, July 4–Aug. 4; letter of James Thomson in C.O. 201:11, Public Record Office. Lieut. J. K. Tuckey, in *An Account of a Voyage to New South Wales* (London, 1805), p. 50, mentions that in the library of the Antonian monks at Rio, in 1802, he was shown an English book inscribed, July 23, 1794, "Bibliotheca Ordinis Sancti Antonii Fratrum Observantiae sue Thomas Muir de Hunters Hill, gente Scotus, animâ orbis terrarum civis obtulit", etc.

¹³ Arrêté of 30 pluviose an II. (Feb. 18, 1794), in *Recueil des Actes du Comité de Salut Public*, XI, 242; quoted, from a copy in the Archives des Affaires Etrangères at Paris, by Meikle, p. 146. That the order was carried out appears from Roquesante to the minister of foreign relations (Delacroix), 13 floréal an V. (May 2, 1797), Archives Nationales, AF III, 62, dossier 246; and from Muir to the viceroy Branciforte, Aug. 20, 1796, Seville, Archivo General de Indias, Papeles de Estado, Guadalajara, leg. 1, which names the *Alcide* and the *Fabius* as the frigates Muir had seen mentioned in American newspapers. See also *Moniteur*, 12 frimaire an VI. (Dec. 2, 1797), article by the artist David.

vifs scélérats et les philosophes courageux qui lui portent ombrages."¹⁴ But if scholars and scoundrels were sent indiscriminately to the same land of exile, their treatment when they got there was not identical. Lieutenant-governor Grose had been informed that he was not at liberty to compel the Scottish prisoners to work, though on the other hand they were not entitled to any provision from the crown without doing such service as might be thought fit.¹⁵ In November, Judge Advocate Collins records that

The lieutenant-governor having set apart for each of the gentlemen who came out from Scotland in the *Surprise* a brick hut, in a row on the east side of the cove, they took possession of their new habitations, and soon declared that they found sufficient reason for thinking "the bleak and desolate shores of New Holland" not quite so terrible as in England they had been led to expect.¹⁶

Skirving writes that Grose

sent one of his lieutenants to inform us that we were at full liberty in the colony, but that he had no instructions to permit us to leave it. . . . He appointed a good brick house to each of us, all of them adjoining; and as we would receive nothing from the stores . . . he sent to us requesting that as we might need some things which were not to be got for money in the place, we would use the freedom to send him a list of what things we found necessary, and if they could be had he would provide us himself.¹⁷

Muir, Palmer, and Skirving had farms together in the country and were allowed convicts to clear their land.¹⁸ In a letter to his wife (December 12, 1794)¹⁹ Skirving speaks of the servant allowed him by the governor, while Muir writes by the same mail: "Of our treatment here I cannot speak too highly; gratitude will forever bind me to the officers, civil and military."²⁰

Shortly after his arrival in New South Wales, in September, 1795, Governor Hunter wrote to a friend in Scotland that

The four gentlemen whom the activity of the magistrates of Edinburgh provided for our colony I have seen and conversed with separately since my arrival here; they seem all of them very gifted in powers of conversation. Muir was the first I saw; I thought him a sensible modest young man, of a very retired turn, which certainly his situation in this country will give him opportunity of indulging; he said nothing on the severity

¹⁴ *Moniteur*, *ibid.*

¹⁵ *Historical Records of New South Wales*, II. 856.

¹⁶ Collins's *Account of the English Colony of New South Wales* (1798), I.

¹⁷ *Historical Records*, II. 872.

¹⁸ *Gentleman's Magazine*, March, 1797, I. 245.

¹⁹ Printed in *Trial of William Skirving*.

²⁰ *Historical Records*, II. 869.

of his fate, but seemed to bear his circumstances with a proper degree of fortitude and resignation.²¹

Melancholy fortitude is indeed the note of the letter he wrote while Hunter's kindly description of him was on its way to Scotland.

I live, live faithful to the cause of freedom, and live in a manner not unworthy of its adherents. Surrounded by successive scenes of manifold affliction, the prospect of life, as it lengthens, darkening, I say, and say in the sincerity of my soul, that the sufferings of individual man ought never to be reckoned in account, if conducive to the sum of general happiness. Let then this end require greater sacrifices, life or years of exile protracted unto the term of life, these sacrifices I am prepared to offer. Nor is this the effect of enthusiasm. Enthusiasm may dazzle its victim and his spectators in the glare of public exhibition, but in dungeons, in the long years of obscure exile, surrounded by beings who degrade the name of man, it must subside, it must dissipate and leave to the mind a solitary and a fearful void. Let me then repeat, without ostentation, what upon entering the career of life I have proclaimed. I have been, I am, and until I sink into the grave I shall continue to be, the advocate of the oppressed.²²

Palmer, the elderly Unitarian minister, could write more cheerfully, and asserts that

The soil is capital, the climate delicious. I will take it upon me to say, that it will soon be the region of plenty, and wants only *virtue* and *liberty* to be another America. . . . To a philosophic mind it is a land of wonder and delight; to him it is a new creation: the beasts, the fish, the birds, the reptiles, the plants, the trees, the flowers, are all new.²³

But even the philosophic mind cannot long be content with the wonders of nature; it is filled with longing for friends and books, for news and freedom. Six months later a ship sailed into the harbor which for a short while these unfortunate prisoners took to be either a British or an American frigate sent to take them away from Australia. She turned out to be an Indian trader. "Good Heavens!" cries Palmer, "what were my sensations! Mocked with groundless joy to be plunged again into melancholy."²⁴

The question of their right to leave Australia had been raised by the exiles promptly upon Governor Hunter's arrival in the colony. Muir, Palmer, and Skirving had addressed to him, October 14, 1795, a letter pointing out that their sentence did not involve any abridgment of their freedom, once they had reached Australia, nor of their freedom of movement except that to return to Great Britain within the fourteen years would subject them to the penalty of death.²⁵

²¹ *Historical Records*, II. 882.

²² *Monthly Repository*, XII., extracts in the Mitchell Library.

²³ *Narrative of the Sufferings of T. F. Palmer and W. Skirving*.

²⁴ *Monthly Repository*, XII.

Apparently they were quite right. A few days later the governor writes to the Home Secretary that, after reading the sentence and the printed trial, he was obliged to confess that he could not feel himself justifiable in forcibly detaining them in New South Wales against their consent.²⁶ He asks for instructions, and reports that they "have not accepted of any Provision from the public Store since their Arrival—they have lived quiet, retired, as much at their Ease as men in their Circumstances can be supposed to be".

It was America that offered the actual opportunity for escape. That country had shared in the popular outburst of feeling aroused on behalf of the victims of the trials for sedition, and the account of Muir's was reprinted in New York and widely read.²⁷ Letters to interest "the first people in America" in Muir had been written when he was thought to be going there in 1793;²⁸ while Gerald was known personally in the States, having spent four years in Pennsylvania practising at the bar.²⁹ It is therefore possible that somebody's theoretic sympathy resolved itself into practical help, and the author of a pamphlet biography of Muir, the Glasgow radical Peter MacKenzie, tells a circumstantial tale to this effect.³⁰ What credence may be given to such a story is a question that may be examined later. At all events, on April 30, 1796, Governor Hunter had to inform the Home Secretary that Thomas Muir had escaped from the colony.³¹

An American ship named the *Otter*, commanded by Ebenezer Dorr, and belonging to Boston, having touched at this port to refresh his ship's company, and to have some small repairs done to the ship, being bound on a voyage to the north-west coast of America and China, after having

²⁵ Letter of Oct. 14, 1795, in London Public Record Office, C.O. 201: 12.

²⁶ Hunter to Portland, Oct. 25, 1795, C. O. 201: 12. In his letter of July 14, 1796, to Messrs. Lyndsay and Shields, and in that of July 15, 1796, to President Washington, both in the Archivo General de Indias, Seville, Papeles de Estado, Guadalajara, leg. 1, Muir declares that the British ministry admitted his legal right to go elsewhere, but that this admission was made merely to allay popular feeling, and would have been nugatory and unavailing in that remote region; but apparently he was wrong as to this last. Hunter shows no feeling when reporting his escape, Apr. 30, 1796, C.O. 201: 13; *Historical Records*, III. 46.

²⁷ There were at least three editions, the second and third published at New York, 1794. Senator Giles said in the Senate, Nov. 26, 1794, "Are not Muir and Palmer, and the other martyrs of Scottish despotism, toasted from one end of the continent to the other?" *Annals of Congress*, IV. 918. B. Drew, in an article (otherwise of no consequence) on Muir in *Old and New*, IX. 316, declares that in later years parts of Muir's address to his judges were favorite declamations in New England schoolhouses.

²⁸ *Trial*, p. 168.

²⁹ *Dictionary of National Biography*.

³⁰ *Life of Thomas Muir* (Glasgow, 1831), pp. 34-35.

³¹ C.O. 201: 13; *Historical Records*, III. 47.

been treated here with much civility, and assisted in his repairs as far as it was in our power to forward them, he, contrary to a very pointed article in the Port Orders, which he had received on his arrival, carried from hence several people, for whose embarkation he had not obtained any permission, and, amongst the number, Mr. Thomas Muir.

Collins relates that "the American, either finding the market over-stocked, or having some other motive for touching at Port Jackson, declared that he had nothing for sale; but that he could, as a favour, spare two hogsheads of Jamaica rum, three pipes of Madeira, sixty-eight quarter casks of Lisbon wine, four chests and a half of Rohe tea, and two hogsheads of molasses".³² Later he records the escape, and says that Muir left a letter stating his intention to practise as an advocate at the American bar.³³

Muir's own account of his escape, as given in subsequent letters preserved in Spanish archives, is that Captain Dorr, coming into Port Jackson in January, 1796,³⁴ agreed to give him a passage to Boston provided he could effect his escape without danger to Dorr; that his companions, Palmer, Gerald, and Skirving, two of whom were in failing health, urged him, as still young and strong, to seize the opportunity; that on the evening of February 18, the day before Dorr was to sail, he put to sea in a small boat, with two servants, taking nothing with him but the shirt and coat on his back; and that about the middle of the next day they were taken into the *Otter*, at a considerable distance from the land. In that fur-trading vessel they crossed the

³² Collins, I. 452. Barrington, at the delivery of whose celebrated prologue about "leaving our country for our country's good", Jan. 16, 1796, Muir was most likely present, a month before his departure, says much the same. *History of New South Wales* (second ed.), p. 156. Ebenezer Dorr, Jr. (1762-1846) was of a family much connected with the early trade to the Northwest Coast; genealogical information from Miss Marian H. Dorr of Newton Highlands, Mass., and Bancroft, *History of California*, I. 538-540. At a meeting of the Massachusetts Historical Society in January, 1803, acknowledgment is made of the gift of "a valuable collection of Curiosities, from the north-west coast of America, from Mr. Ebenezer Dorr, Jr.;" *Proceedings*, I. 156. Members of the family possess many logs of its early voyages, but not of the *Otter*, but the register of clearances from the port of Boston, preserved in the archives of the Treasury Department at Washington, notes her clearance, Aug. 20, 1795, and gives as her cargo precisely the goods named by Collins, above, and no others. That Muir's rescue or flight was not the first of such escapes may be judged from a remark of Capt. W. R. Broughton, R. N., who sailed from Port Jackson in H. M. S. *Providence*, Oct. 13, 1795, "We abstained from following the example of other ships that have touched at this colony, by not taking away any of the convicts, a practice very general in merchant ships"; *A Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean* (London, 1804), p. 21.

³³ Collins, I. 457.

³⁴ Jan. 24, according to Collins, I. 453, and Barrington, p. 154.

Pacific, and, "after visiting the lately discovered islands, and exploring some hitherto unknown", arrived in Nootka Sound on June 19.³⁵

But we are not without information from another quarter respecting the escape and respecting the subsequent course of the *Otter*, information drawn out into great detail, which we owe partly to Muir, partly to the inveterate writing habits of Spanish colonial officials and the minute care with which they felt obliged to report all transactions to their home government and ask its approval.

In order to enforce the regulations by which Spain since the Nootka Sound convention of 1790 had essayed to prohibit vessels not Spanish or British from access to the northwest coast of America, the Marqués de Branciforte, viceroy of New Spain in 1796, resolved to send some small vessel from his Pacific naval station of San Blas, every six months, to sail up along that coast and warn intruders away.³⁶ The first such vessel to be sent out was the *Sutil*, which in 1792 had played a chief part in the expedition of Galiano and Valdés to the Straits of Juan de Fuca. Under the command of Don José Tovar, *primer piloto*, the *Sutil* sailed out from San Blas on March 16, 1796, with a company which, including the captain, numbered fifteen. On June 16 she entered Nootka Sound, with five or six of her nine sailors ill. Finding that they did not recover there, Tovar was about to depart on June 19, when the *Otter* sailed into the harbor. The launch of the *Sutil* was sent with its pilot to bring the *Otter* to anchorage. Presently Captain Dorr, Muir, and one of the sailors came over to the *Sutil*, where Dorr exhibited what seemed to be a passport from the Spanish consul at Charleston, South Carolina.³⁷

It appeared that the *Otter* was very short of provisions, but over-supplied with men, for thirty-two had somehow, most of them appar-

³⁵ Muir to Lyndsay and Shields and to Lord Lauderdale, July 14, 1796, to President Washington, John Craig Millar, and Dr. Joseph Priestley, July 15, all in A.G.I., Seville, Estado, Guadalajara, leg. 1; also to the French Directory, 11 prairial an V., in Arch. Aff. Etr., Corresp. Pol., Espagne, 648, ff. 48-50. Gerald died Mar. 13, Skirving Mar. 16, 1796. *Trial of William Skirving*, pp. 24, 25; Collins, I. 469, says Mar. 16 and 19.

³⁶ Branciforte to Príncipe de la Paz, Sept. 26, 1796, no. 340, A.G.I., Seville, Papeles de Estado, Mexico, leg. 6.

³⁷ "Extracto del diario de la navegación que ha hecho la goleta *Sutil*", etc., enclosed in Branciforte to Paz, Sept. 26, 1796, no. 340, *ubi supra*. "Testimonio del Exp'te contra el primer Piloto Don José Tovar," ff. 8-12, depositions of Francisco Molina, Pedro Rios, Pedro Estrada, and José Tovar, A.G.I., Estado, *ibid.* Borica, governor of California, in a letter to Branciforte, Nov. 5, Archivo General de Mexico, Provincias Internas, VI., exp. 16, says that when Dorr arrived at Monterey he showed him passports from General Washington (his clearance, no doubt) and the Spanish consul at Charleston. A subordinate of the governor records that he showed "los pasaportes del consul de España y el del Presidente del Congreso"; Archives of California, State Papers, Sacramento, VI. 86, Oct. 27, 1796.

ently with less difficulty than Muir, got aboard at Port Jackson. Learning of Tovar's desire to carry on his cruise farther north, to Bucareli, Dorr represented to him that he could not safely do it with so few men (he himself had had three sailors killed by the Indians at Clayoquot) and offered, in return for provisions, to let him have five seamen from the *Otter*. The Spaniard hesitated, not knowing whether he could defend such an action to his superiors at San Blas, and declaring that no promises of pay could be made except by those officials. Finally, however, his exigencies caused him to agree. Five sailors from the *Otter* came over voluntarily, strongly dissatisfied with their treatment by Dorr, and willing to serve for their rations till they reached San Blas.³⁸

At midnight before the day on which the *Sutil* sailed out from Nootka (June 22) Thomas Muir also came on board. He wished to go to the United States, and, perceiving that the *Otter* would spend some time on the Northwest Coast and then sail to China and so home by way of the Cape of Good Hope, he believed that he should reach Philadelphia sooner by way of San Blas—six months against eighteen, he calculated; there was also the danger that at Canton or Macao he might be recognized by the English and returned to captivity.³⁹ Another reason for apprehension lay in the fact that, as Muir learned from the Spaniards, the Indians reported the British frigate *Providence*, Captain Broughton, which had sailed from Botany Bay a short time before Muir's escape, to have lately been for some days in Nootka Sound and on departure to have declared her intention of returning.⁴⁰

The mate, the carpenter, and the supercargo of the *Sutil* understood, and so testified at the subsequent trial of their captain, that

³⁸ "Extracto" and "Testimonio", as cited in the preceding note.

³⁹ Tovar to Don Jacinto Caamaño, acting commander at San Blas, Aug. 12, 1796, and Borica to Branciforte, July 13, both enclosed in Branciforte to Paz, Sept. 26, no. 340, A.G.I., Estado, Mexico, leg. 6; "Testimonio", deposition of Tovar.

⁴⁰ Muir to Lyndsay and Shields, July 14, 1796; to the French Directory, 11 prairial an V.; "Extracto del diario de la *Sutil*"; Borica to Branciforte, July 13. The *Providence* had been in Sydney Cove from Aug. 25 to Oct. 13, 1795, sailed then to Tahiti and the Sandwich Islands, was at Nootka Sound from Mar. 17 to May 21, 1796, and at Monterey June 6–20, whence she sailed for the Sandwich Islands and Japan. Broughton, *A Voyage of Discovery*, pp. 19–21, 48–54, 61–67; P.R.O., Adm., Captains' Logs 4490; Broughton to Nepean, Oct. 5, 1795, in Captains' Letters, Adm. 1:1511; from his visit to Monterey there is a group of documents in Archivo General de Mexico, Californias, 37, exp. 3, relating to £250 worth of astronomical instruments he had brought out from London for Bodega y Quadra, who however had in the meantime died; but Broughton left Monterey June 20, and nowhere is there any evidence that he had any designs against Muir.

Muir had been transported to New Holland;⁴¹ Tovar himself declared to his commandant at San Blas that, as well as he understood Muir, the suppliant was "a Scottish gentleman who, for defending his country and the Christian States of Ireland, had been persecuted by the British government, which finally had banished him from the island, but that he could go where he would in other parts of the world, and, finding himself in New Holland, had concluded to embark on the aforesaid *Otter*".⁴²

Don José Tovar had served his king for twenty-six of his forty-two years, and for nineteen years had held his present position of *primer piloto* in the naval establishment at San Blas. He was, said the viceroy,⁴³ a competent pilot but lacking in political intelligence. He yielded to Muir's importunities, moved thereto by compassion and thinking that he had some precedents, as when Martinez in 1789 took in John Kendrick, jr., son of the captain of the *Columbia*, who was now *piloto segundo*.⁴⁴ Later he had his misgivings, for Muir, who had come on board the *Sutil* without money or other belongings than a mattress and a valise, both borrowed from Dorr, told stories that seemed to Tovar inconsistent, especially about a sum of two hundred dollars left by him in Dorr's hands.⁴⁵ Put upon his trial on his return to San Blas, the worthy captain was excused as to his acceptance of needed seamen, but for his complaisance to Muir, contrary to definite law, he was dismissed and declared incapable of further command. The sentence was approved by the viceroy—though he thought Tovar's action due only to his stupidity and ignorance, and the lively astuteness of Muir and Dorr—and by the king.⁴⁶

Before coming to San Blas, however, the *Sutil*, which had been compelled by strong northerly winds to give up the thought of sailing

⁴¹ "Testimonio", depositions of Molina, Rios, and Estrada.

⁴² Tovar to Caamaño, Aug. 12, 1796, *ubi supra*.

⁴³ Branciforte to Paz, Sept. 26, 1796, in A.G.I., Estado, Mexico, leg. 6.

⁴⁴ Tovar to Caamaño, Aug. 12; "Testimonio", deposition of Tovar. Branciforte to Paz, Sept. 26, 1796, no. 341 (a different despatch from that of the same date already mentioned, but in the same *legajo* at the A.G.I.). Branciforte explains that, Kendrick wishing to become a Catholic and enter the service of Spain, and Bodega y Quadra favoring the preceding viceroy had given him the position named, and the king had approved, but now a more rigid exclusion of foreigners is rightly in force, and in view of the dangerous character of the United States as neighbors it is best that Kendrick should go, though his conduct has been excellent; so the viceroy intends to send him as interpreter with Muir. We find him acting as interpreter at the examination of Tovar, Sept. 12; "Testimonio", f. 1 v.

⁴⁵ Tovar to Caamaño, Aug. 12, 1796.

⁴⁶ "Testimonio", *ad fin.*; Branciforte to Paz, Sept. 26, 1796, no. 340; decree of May 10, 1797, in "Expediente de Tomas Muir", A.G.I., Estado, Mexico, leg. 23, no. 6.

northward beyond Nootka, put into the harbor of Monterey and remained there more than a fortnight (July 5-21) that her crew might recover their health.⁴⁷ There the governor of California, Don Diego de Borica, had much talk with Muir. No small entertainment it must have been to the governor at that lonely post to talk with one who, as he reports to the viceroy, "was in Paris during the great revolutions of '92 and '93, gives very circumstantial accounts of all that occurred, and paints with very vivid colors the characters of the principal personages, such as Mirabeau, Condorcet, Lafayette, Dumouriez, Brissot, Robespierre, Danton, Tallien, Égalité, and others, and appears not less informed as to the political state of England". At the governor's request, Muir wrote out for him, in French, a summary of his career, drawn off from a copy of his printed *Trial* which he presented to the governor. He also gave him an engraved portrait of himself, which had come to him in Botany Bay from his friends in England, and he could not resist the temptation to tell Borica that they intended to erect a marble statue of him, "for the spirit and energy with which he had defended the rights of the Scottish people, who had chosen him as their deputy". Borica sent pamphlet and portrait to the viceroy;⁴⁸ the viceroy sent the pamphlet and an excellent copy of the engraved portrait to his brother-in-law, Godoy, Prince of the Peace, prime minister of Spain, and the portrait may now be seen in one of the glass exhibition-cases in the Archives of the Indies at Seville.

This portrait has a history of its own, not without interest. It is recounted—in substantially the same terms—in a letter printed in the autobiographical *Memoir of Thomas Hardy*,⁴⁹ the English radical, whose trial in 1794 for sedition was as famous as the Scottish trials of Muir and his associates in the preceding year, and in a manuscript letter of Hardy's, accompanied by a copy of the engraving, in the celebrated Place Collection in the British Museum.⁵⁰ In the latter epistle Hardy says:

⁴⁷ "Testimonio", f. 13 v.; "Extracto del diario de la Sutil".

⁴⁸ Borica to Branciforte, July 13, 1796, *ubi supra*.

⁴⁹ *Memoir* (London, 1832), p. 49, letter dated Mar. 3, 1821, to Mr. Witherspoon, Cheapside, who, as Hardy had lately learned from him, had in his possession "a box of manuscripts, letters, and papers of that excellent man, the late Thomas Muir".

⁵⁰ Francis Place Collection, vol. 36, pp. 1 and 3. The editor is indebted to Mr. Henry W. Meikle, author of *Scotland and the French Revolution*, for mention of this *exemplaire* of the print, which he had sought in vain elsewhere. He had supposed the picture at Seville, of which he had a photostat print, to be the identical print given by Muir to Borica, but when he had an opportunity to inspect it, in the Archive of the Indies (in October, 1921), he found it to be a most excel-

In the month of March 1794 when the *Surprise Transport*, Captn. Campbell, lay off Portsmouth at the Mother Bank, on Board of which those persecuted patriots Muir, Palmer, Margarot and Skirving were conveyed to Botany Bay for 14 years . . . I went to Portsmouth . . . was on board of the *Surprise* at the time and saw the late Mr. Banks of Newman St., an eminent statuary, take a cast from Muir's face, from which he afterwards made a Bust, and from which the present engraving is taken by Thomas Holloway. It is a correct likeness.

The engraving, dated 1795, bears, below the portrait, the legend, "Engraved by T. Holloway from a Bust modelled by Tho. Banks, Esq., R. A." (Banks was a friend of the radicals) and the appropriate lines (from Thomson's *Hymn*):

Should fate command me to the farthest verge
Of this green earth, to distant barbarous climes,
'Tis nought to me; I cannot go
Where universal love not smiles around,
From seeming evil still educating good,
And better thence again, and better still,
In infinite progression—

lines suggested for this inscription, so Muir tells us, by his friend the poetess Mrs. Letitia Barbauld.⁵¹

The days of converse with Don Diego de Borica were certainly not less grateful to Muir than to the governor. After a four-months' voyage in the South Sea with thirty-two British jailbirds or miscellaneous sailors and a hard-fisted Yankee shipmaster, Monterey must have seemed a haven of rest. Muir expanded in that bright and genial air. He wrote copious letters, in the glowing rhetoric in which literary young gentlemen, conscious of noble souls, were accustomed to write in the closing years of the eighteenth century, to his father and mother, to President Washington, to the Whig earls of Lauderdale and Stanhope, to Dr. Priestley, to John Craig Millar, to Lyndsay and Shields, and other friends, and to the viceroy of New Spain. The prudent governor, or still more prudent viceroy, took copies of them, and so preserved them to us.⁵² Muir spoke with grateful

lent lead-pencil reproduction, doubtless made in the city of Mexico for the viceroy. It bears the legends, "F. Porrillo. Porrillo fecit. Año 1796."

⁵¹ Muir to Lyndsay and Shields, July 14, 1796.

⁵² Letters of July 14 and 15, 1796, in A.G.I., Estado, Guad., leg. 1. The addresses have in some cases to be inferred from internal evidence, the transcripts not bearing the names. Lauderdale had visited Muir in prison; Meikle, p. 136. Millar, son of Muir's law professor at Glasgow, and prominent in the Society of the Friends of the People, had in 1795, like Dr. Priestley and many another radical, retired to America, where he died in 1796, "in the back country of Pennsylvania". *Ibid.*, p. 157; Craig, in Millar's *Origin of the Distinction of Ranks*, p. cxxxi; *Autobiography of Mrs. Fletcher* (Edinburgh, 1876), p. 71; Dugald Stewart to Jefferson, Mar. 1, 1795, in Jefferson MSS., Lib. Cong.; *Scots Mag.*, LVIII, 792 and

warmth of the kindness of Tovar, Borica, and Señora Borica, who with her own hands made portable soups to sustain him during the remainder of his voyage by sea. In all these letters, save to his father and mother, he spoke of his health as greatly impaired; while to his parents he declared himself—but we all have done that—to be perfectly well. The young reformer's mental poise, too, was no longer at its best. Along with the warm affection for his friends which forms so pleasing a trait of all his letters, we see the growth of no small measure of egotism. "My Exile", he writes to one of the Whig lords,⁵³ "splendid in its cause, and proud in the applauding voice of my country, claims a new lustre from the toils and the dangers by which it has been redeemed."

To President Washington Muir wrote at full length of his escape and subsequent adventures, of his desire to come to Philadelphia, and of his intention, unless some change in British politics permitted him to return to Scotland, to "consume the remainder of my days in the United States, happy if, in the narrow range of my abilities, I may be able to demonstrate by their exertion my devotion and my attachment to the land of my adoption". Having from his infancy considered himself as the pupil of him whom he now addressed, he gloried in the fact "that, in a land permitted almost to be visited by none, the Name of General Washington presents me everywhere respect and attention"; and he mentions that he has drawn upon Washington for whatever necessary expenses might attend his journey, confident that these bills would be joyfully reimbursed in Europe.

In his letter to the viceroy Muir described his efforts to bring liberty to Scotland and to the Catholics of Ireland, his condemnation and escape, and his reasons for placing himself in the hospitable care of Don José Tovar. He solicited the viceroy's permission to pass through his dominions to Philadelphia and President Washington, and promised him the eternal gratitude, not only of the writer but of millions interested in his fortunes.⁵⁴

Sent on by Borica in accordance with the law respecting foreigners, Muir arrived with the *Sutil* at San Blas on August 12,⁵⁵

864. One of the friends about whom Muir inquired was Dr. Thomas Cooper; another was James Thomson Callender, of unenviable fame, who had been a member of the Edinburgh Convention, and with whom he "hoped to spend some attic [Attic?] evenings, once more". In one of his letters to Jefferson, Oct. 26, 1798, Callender says, speaking of Muir and Palmer, "I was their intimate friend, and quite as deep in the unlucky business as they were"; *N. E. Hist. Gen. Register*, L. 330.

⁵³ Stanhope, apparently.

⁵⁴ Muir to Branciforte, Monterey, July 17, 1796, A.G.I., Estado, Guad., leg. 1.

⁵⁵ "Extracto del diario de la *Sutil*."

from which unhealthy port, by further complaisance on the captain's part, he was allowed to go up to the more salubrious air of Tepic.⁵⁶ He wrote again to the viceroy from that place, expressing his desire to go to Philadelphia and place himself under the protection of President Washington until the ministerial revolution in England should occur which he confidently expected; and, calculating that, travelling economically to Havana, he would need not more than seven or eight hundred dollars for that purpose, he asked the viceroy to advance that sum, assuring him that General Washington would duly honor whatever bills the exile might draw upon him in the viceroy's favor.⁵⁷

Branciforte, however, deemed it wiser, in the case of one who, rightly or wrongly, had been condemned by British law, not to deviate from the usual routine followed in the cases of those who infringed Spain's regulations against the presence of unauthorized foreigners in the Indies.⁵⁸ He ordered that Muir should be escorted from Tepic to the capital, not as a prisoner but honorably and humanely, "economically yet with some distinction", by Don Salvador Fidalgo, who had commanded the *Princesa* in 1793 and had now just returned to San Blas from Macao in the *Activo*, and his lieutenant Don Andrés Salazar. From Mexico he was to be escorted to Vera Cruz, and then shipped to Spain.⁵⁹

The same fate was decreed for the five sailors who had been taken over from the *Otter* at Nootka, but they were reported ill at Tepic and in the hospital at San Blas, where one of them died a month after landing, and two others soon after, while the remaining two, leaving that place at the end of October, and detained again by illness at Guadalajara, did not reach the capital till the last month of the year nor Vera Cruz till January, 1797. There they remained,

⁵⁶ "Testimonio", ff. 1 v., 15 v. At Tepic Muir found a friend in a brother Scot, Robert Gibson, who apparently was on his way to Manila. A grateful letter to him, Vera Cruz, Oct. 22, 1796, is in Arch. Gen. Mexico, Californias, 37, exp. 3.

⁵⁷ Muir to Branciforte, Aug. 20, 1796, A.G.I., Estado, Guad., leg. 1.

⁵⁸ Branciforte to Paz, Sept. 26, 1796, no. 340.

⁵⁹ Branciforte to Paz, Oct. 11, 1796, no. 344, A.G.I., Estado, Mex., leg. 6; "Expediente de Tomas Muir", *ibid.*, leg. 23, no. 6; "Extracto" (as to *Activo*). With Muir was sent the Philadelphia Irishman Joseph Burling O'Cain, who had been marooned at Santa Barbara by his English captain in 1794; Arch. Gen. Mexico, Provincias Internas, VI., exp. 16, and Arch. California, State Papers, Sacramento, IV. 68; S. E. Morison, *Maritime History of Massachusetts*, pp. 60, 61. There are grateful letters from Muir to Fidalgo and Salazar, in French, Vera Cruz, Oct. 22, in Arch. Gen. Mexico, Californias, 37, exp. 3.

working in the naval arsenal, till July, when they were shifted to Havana, and ultimately (May, 1798) to Spain.⁶⁰

Muir, meanwhile, had reached the capital city on October 12, 1796,⁶¹ and by the twenty-second was at Vera Cruz.⁶² The viceroy's orders to the governor of Vera Cruz were that he should be sent by the first ship going to Cadiz or Coruña, consigned to the *juez de arribadas* there.⁶³ War having now broken out between Great Britain and Spain, Muir requested to be sent, for greater security, on a war-vessel. On such a vessel he was embarked on November 9 for Havana.⁶⁴ There he was detained for nearly four months by the captain-general, the Conde de Santa Clara, until, on March 25, 1797, he sailed for Cadiz in the *Ninfa* frigate.⁶⁵ Throughout the whole journey from San Blas to Havana he was treated with consideration but with caution. He was not allowed, on account of the dangerous character of his political principles, to circulate freely in the Mexican cities, but he had an honorable escort, travelled by coach from Mexico to Vera Cruz, and received pecuniary support from the viceregal treasury. In Havana he was kept in a fortress, but had his liberty within its limits, and was given a modest daily allowance of money. His frequent intemperance greatly displeased the captain-general, but when ill he was carefully tended in the military hospital.

Muir had not been long gone on his final voyage when Santa Clara, to his great surprise and indignation, received a flaming letter from Victor Hugues, agent of the French Directory in the Windward Islands, demanding the release of Muir, declaring that, against the law of nations and the right of asylum, he was kept in chains and in a dungeon, while an assassin and a robber would have found protection, and proclaiming that the cruel and barbarous conduct of the

⁶⁰ Branciforte to Paz, Oct. 11, 1796, A.G.I., Estado, Mexico, leg. 6; "Testimonio", depositions of Andrew Clark, John Coombs, and Thomas Draper; summary of *expediente*, Arch. Gen. Mexico, Californias, 37, exp. 3; Conde de Santa Clara, captain-general of Havana, to Paz, May 26, 1798, A.G.I., Estado, Mexico, leg. 18, no. 32. Kendrick made his way from Vera Cruz to Havana late in 1797, and survived till 1820. W. Sturgis in *North Am. Rev.*, XV, 385.

⁶¹ Branciforte to Paz, Oct. 27, no. 351, A.G.I., Estado, Mex., leg. 6, no. 56. The ancient road over which he passed, from San Blas to the city of Mexico, still exists, and is entertainingly described by Mr. Herbert Corey, "Along the Old Spanish Road in Mexico", in the *National Geographic Magazine*, March, 1923.

⁶² Letters from him on that day, to Fidalgo, Salazar, and Gibson, already mentioned, and to Dr. Daniel Sullivan in Mexico; A.G. Mex., Calif., 37. He writes from the house of Captain Abercromby, a hospitable Scottish relative.

⁶³ To Paz, Oct. 11.

⁶⁴ *Expediente* of Thomas Muir, made up for the Príncipe de la Paz, in A.G.I., Mex., leg. 23, no. 6.

⁶⁵ Santa Clara to Branciforte, Mar. 24, 1797, A.G. Mex., Calif., 37, exp. 3.

viceroy, which had been made known to the Directory and to all Europe, "would mark an epoch in the annals of the age".⁶⁶

To this strong language the captain-general replied with becoming spirit, detailing the kindness, and defending the precautions, with which Muir had been surrounded. Both he and the viceroy, whom he presently consulted, agreed in attributing these accusations to the "ingratitude, falsity, and perfidy of that unquiet man".⁶⁷ Whether they were right in this it is impossible to say. In a subsequent letter to the French Directory, Muir declared that while he received humane and honorable treatment in Mexico (and Branciforte had his various letters of thanks as evidence), in Havana he was kept for four months a prisoner and endured every sort of ill-treatment.⁶⁸ On the other hand, he wrote to Archibald Hamilton Rowan, from Havana, that he was "well and humanely treated, though at present a prisoner as an Englishman".⁶⁹ Hugues may well have received his information from others.

Meanwhile, Muir had almost reached Cadiz when, on April 26, the *Ninfa* and her consort the *Santa Elena* had the misfortune to encounter two British vessels of superior force, a part of the blockading squadron of Sir John Jervis. An engagement ensued in Conil Bay, in which the *Ninfa* was captured.⁷⁰ Before the fight Muir had requested to be set on shore, but, his request being refused, he fought bravely by the captain's side.⁷¹ Near the end of the engagement, he

⁶⁶ Hugues to Santa Clara, Basseterre, 1 floréal an V. (Apr. 20, 1797), enclosed in Branciforte to Paz, Aug. 30, A.G.I., Estado, Mex., leg. 7. In a rhetorical letter of earlier date to the Directory, 24 germinal (Apr. 13), Arch. Aff. Etr., Corresp. Pol., Angleterre, 590, f. 260, Hugues declares that Muir had been loaded with irons in New Spain, and kept naked in a dungeon in Havana.

⁶⁷ Branciforte to Paz, Aug. 30, 1797, A.G.I., Estado, Mex., leg. 7, enclosing the letter of Hugues to Santa Clara, the latter's reply, May 7, Santa Clara to Branciforte, May 9, and Branciforte to Santa Clara, July 14.

⁶⁸ Muir to the Directory, 11 prairial an V. (May 30, 1797), Arch. Aff. Etr., Corresp. Pol., Espagne, 648, f. 48. Two of his letters of gratitude to Branciforte, originals, Tepic, Sept. 11, and Vera Cruz, Oct. 22, 1796, are in A.G.I., Estado, Mex., leg. 6.

⁶⁹ Letter of Dec. 3, 1796, quoted in a letter of Rowan to his wife, Wilmington, Del., Feb. 10, 1797, as "this moment received"; *Autobiography* (Dublin, 1840), pp. 315-316.

⁷⁰ Accounts of the engagement are in the report of Capt. George Martin of the *Irresistible*, 74, to Jervis, Apr. 28, 1797, P.R.O., Adm. 1:396, no. 71; in the *London Gazette*, 1797, p. 446; in Clowes, *Royal Navy*, IV, 509; in James (ed. 1860), II, 93; and in Fernández Duro, *La Armada Española*, VIII, 141, who dates it Apr. 27.

⁷¹ Report of Fonsegra, commander of the *Ninfa*, summarized in the *expediente* made up for Godoy, A.G.I., Estado, Mex., leg. 23, no. 6; no. 589 in Torres Lanzas, *Independencia de América*, I, 176.

was severely wounded in the face, losing his left eye and being so badly disfigured that the British captors, who learned that he had been on board and sought for him, passed him by without recognition. It was reported in Scotland that he had been killed in the action,⁷² but in reality he was sent ashore with the other wounded and taken to a hospital on the Isla de Leon, in Cadiz harbor.

Muir's presence in the hospital and his plight presently became known to the French consul in Cadiz, Citizen Roquesante, who at once befriended him, visited him daily, interested himself greatly in his convalescence, claimed him as a French citizen by virtue of an alleged decree of the French Convention, and urged that he be removed from the hospital to some tavern or the consul's house, where he might recover more surely and rapidly.⁷³

The governor of Cadiz, the Conde de Cumbre Hermosa, regarding Muir as a prisoner of war and a man *de genio vivo y bastante advertido*, who had many friends, declined to order the desired transfer, and the government at Madrid approved his course, urging that Muir should be carefully questioned, and not allowed to escape.⁷⁴

Meanwhile, however, Roquesante had written fully to the Directory of France, and Muir, as soon as he had sufficiently recovered, had done the same, expressing in warm terms his eagerness to come to France, now his only country, and to serve there the cause of liberty and of mankind.⁷⁵ Delacroix, minister of foreign relations, reported in favor of action and supported the consul's representations.

⁷² "He was one of five killed on board the *Nymph* by the last shot fired by us. The officer at whose side he fell is now at my hand and says he behaved with courage to the last"; letter from an officer on the *Irresistible*, Apr. 28, to his father in Glasgow, in Edinburgh *Advertiser*, June, p. 349. Capt. Martin, quoted in letter from on board the *Orion*, Apr. 29, in *Caledonian Mercury*, May 29. *Ibid.*, June 1, 15. But, *ibid.*, June 10, extract from a letter from an officer on board the *Irresistible*, May 5: "By a vessel just now come out of Cadiz we understand Mr. Muir is not dead, but badly wounded in the face. . . . He says he made his escape from the frigate after we boarded her, where he saw some of his townsmen and countrymen." Mackenzie, long afterward (note 30, *supra*), pp. 39-40, reports that he was recognized by an officer who had been an early schoolfellow and companion, but who refrained from disclosing his identity. Meikle, p. 173.

⁷³ Roquesante to Delacroix, minister of foreign relations, extract, 13 floréal an V. (May 2, 1797), Arch. Nat., AF III, 62, dossier 246; Muir to the Directory, 11 prairial (May 30), Arch. Aff. Etr., Corresp. Pol., Espagne, 648, f. 48; Cumbre Hermosa to Paz, June 2 and 6, A.G.I., Estado, Mex., leg. 23, no. 6, and leg. 18, no. 32; Roquesante to Cumbre Hermosa, 20 prairial (June 8), *ibid.*, leg. 23, no. 6.

⁷⁴ Cumbre Hermosa to Roquesante, June 8, *id.* to Paz, June 9, and the *expediente* made up for the latter, with decrees; all in A.G.I., Estado, Mex., leg. 23, no. 6.

⁷⁵ Roquesante, 13 floréal, Muir, 11 prairial, *ubi sup.*; Muir, 28 thermidor (Aug. 15, 1797), Arch. Aff. Etr., Corr. Pol., Espagne, 649, ff. 194-195.

His successor, Talleyrand, took up the matter with energy.⁷⁶ The ambassador of France, Perignon, even before receiving Talleyrand's instructions, had begun to address to the Prince of the Peace a series of notes upon the subject, and with rising emphasis, in the tone which the representatives of his government had of late become accustomed to employ, demanded the release of Muir (September 11, 1797), not on the ground of citizenship which the consul had maintained, but on the ground of French interest in one who had suffered for his attachment to the French republic.⁷⁷

At first the Prince of the Peace, though it was conceded that Muir was not a prisoner of war, was inclined to demur, even to this final haughty letter. "This person", he wrote on the margin of the official memorandum, "has behaved badly in America, and I have not yet the details", and he added, with a trace of acid due to the supposed machinations with Hugues, "See if it is known what this devil was doing". But the next day he thought better of it, and decreed that Muir should be released, on condition that he should go to Paris and never return to the dominions of the King of Spain.⁷⁸

Muir arrived in France in November, 1797, when the air was full of talk of the coming invasion of England.⁷⁹ "Qu'il vienne parmi nous", writes David, the artist, "cet apôtre de la philosophie, qu'il trouve dans la nouvelle Patrie des amis et des frères, et puissent nos phalanges victorieuses le rappeler bientôt dans le pays qu'il a vu naître, pour y fonder la liberté." Muir's reception at Bordeaux was the occasion for a popular rejoicing; there were speeches and illuminations in his honor, and he had to show himself from the balcony to an admiring crowd.⁸⁰ But his bitter experiences, the persecution of one country and the adulation of another, did their work. He evidently had not that balance that keeps a great man simple in the face of either flattery or attack: his ardor outlasted his powers and his sense of proportion, so that the last few months of his life, as the troublesome protégé of the Directory, and the political pamphleteer, are a disappointment to those who have followed him with interest.

⁷⁶ Delacroix to the Directory, 22 messidor (July 10, 1797), *ibid.*, 648, f. 495; to Roquesante, 2 thermidor (July 20), *ibid.*, 649, f. 45. Talleyrand to Roquesante, Muir, and Perignon, 24 fructidor (Sept. 10, 1797), *ibid.*, 649, ff. 329, 330, 331.

⁷⁷ Perignon to Paz, 6 messidor, 1 fructidor, 25 fructidor, an V. (June 24, Aug. 18, Sept. 11, 1797), A.G.I., Estado, Mex., leg. 18, no. 32.

⁷⁸ *Decretos on the expediente made up for him*, A.G.I., Estado, Mex., leg. 23, no. 6; Paz to Perignon, Sept. 16, *ibid.*; Perignon to Talleyrand, 3 vendémiaire an VI. (Sept. 24, 1797), Arch. Aff. Etr., Corr. Pol., Espagne, 650, f. 7.

⁷⁹ *Moniteur*, 12 frimaire an VI. (Dec. 2, 1797), article by David.

⁸⁰ Michel, *Les Ecossais en France, les Français en Ecosse*, II, 469.

and admiration. His health was broken, and he died in France in January, 1799.⁸¹

The question, whether the *Otter* was sent from America to rescue Thomas Muir, deserves some examination. His biographer, Peter Mackenzie, boldly implicates in the scheme no less a person than the President of the United States himself. This has been repeated by historians of the picturesque order and is now frequently made a part of the legend of the Scottish "Martyrs".⁸² Mackenzie writes of Muir that

His trial in Scotland was reprinted and published in the United States of America, where he was likewise regarded as a martyr in the cause of Freedom. The immortal Washington became interested in his behalf. And some generous men in that hemisphere, touched with sympathy for his sufferings . . . formed the bold project of rescuing him from captivity at all hazards. Unknown to Mr. Muir, and at their own expense, an American ship, called the *Otter*, commanded by Captain Dawes [Dorr], was fitted out for the above purpose at New York, and despatched for Sydney, towards the middle of the year 1795. . . . Captain Dawes, and a few of the crew, who were now aware of the secret, landed almost at the very spot where Mr. Muir was. . . . No suspicion was excited on the part of the authorities. After reconnoitring with breathless anxiety for a few days, Captain Dawes discovered Mr. Muir, and had a short conversation with him. It must have been interesting and gratifying in the extreme to both parties. Not a moment was now to be lost. Mr. Muir readily embraced his generous benefactor—and on the morning of the 11th [sic] February, 1796, he was safely taken on board the *Otter*—and that vessel instantly set sail and departed from Sydney.⁸³

Participation by Washington in any such project may be at once ruled out of consideration. There is no evidence in his biographies

⁸¹ *Moniteur*, 11 pluviose an VII. (Jan. 30, 1799). Meikle, *op. cit.* pp. 174–177. Wolfe Tone, *Life*, ed. 1910, II, 285. In one of his numerous memorials to the Directory, 9 nivôse an VI. (Dec. 29, 1797), Corr. Pol., Angleterre, 592, f. 144, asking for 8000 francs (which were given him) he describes his manner of living; it was simple, but he had to have a carriage and a secretary. John and Benjamin Sword report that "Muir appeared to live in style and kept his carriage"; also, that he was intoxicated when, one evening, they heard him defending religion in discussion with Tom Paine. Meikle, "Two Glasgow Merchants in the French Revolution", in *Scottish Hist. Rev.*, VIII, 154. In another letter to the Directory, undated, Corr. Pol., Angleterre, 590, ff. 321–322, asking for a *domaine national* worth 150,000 fr., Muir offers certain repayment within two years by means of the £3000 he is sure to receive from the London booksellers for the copyright of his voyages and adventures, which he is preparing for publication in two volumes quarto—a design of authorship which he had already indicated in his letter to John Craig Millar from Monterey, July 14, 1796.

⁸² For instance, in *Peeps at the Past*, 1914, a magazine published under the auspices of the Australian Historical Society. Reasons for doubting the truth of the statement were pointed out by another correspondent in the same magazine.

⁸³ Mackenzie, *Life of Thomas Muir*, pp. 34, 35.

and published correspondence, nor, apparently, in his manuscript papers, that he was ever cognizant of the Muir incident; and there is, moreover, evidence that he was distinctly averse from having any relations with people of the class to which Muir now belonged—that of political refugees. Edmund Randolph, secretary of state in 1794 and 1795, reported to Washington that an Irish political prisoner, lately escaped to America, had been brought to his office and introduced to him by a member of the Senate. Washington sharply criticized the "impropriety" of this action, and said that there had been many instances to show that "characters in the predicament" in which the Irishman "A. H. R." was "could not be noticed by the officers of government without giving umbrage".⁸⁴ Least of all is it likely that such a scheme would have commended itself to Washington in August, 1795, when the *Otter* was preparing to sail from America⁸⁵—that at the very time when he was ratifying the Jay Treaty in order to preserve good relations with Great Britain he would have given his approval to a plan for rescuing a British convict from Botany Bay, however unjust he may have thought the sentence. It is impossible to suppose that a statesman of Washington's experience and temperament would, for such a cause, have risked the annoyance of a government with which he was so anxious for friendly relations. It may be conjectured that the legend of Washington's connection with the affair arose merely from Muir's having written to him from Monterey, having drawn bills upon him perhaps, and having put foremost in all his references to the United States an intention of placing himself under the protection of Washington.⁸⁶

The "A. H. R." of whom Washington speaks was Archibald Hamilton Rowan. Now the Edinburgh *Advertiser* of February 14, 1797, publishes a letter from Margarot to Hardy, telling of the escape of Muir. "It is supposed", adds the newspaper, "that the Captain, Mr. Dawes, intended to take away all the five who were sentenced to Transportation for Sedition in Scotland. Hamilton Rowan has been often heard to say that he would send a ship from America for them, and it is conjectured that the *Otter* was hired by him for this pur-

⁸⁴ *Writings of Washington* (ed. Sparks), XI, 36.

⁸⁵ Collins, I, 453, says that Dorr arrived at Port Jackson, Jan. 24, 1796, five months and three days from Boston. This would place the date of sailing of the *Otter* at Aug. 21, 1795. The Boston register of clearances, Treasury Dept. archives, dates her clearance Aug. 20.

⁸⁶ And a letter of a relative, written in 1793, when Muir thought of going to America, and printed at the end of the *Trial*, says confidently that "once he were there, he'll get letters to General Washington". See also note 57.

pose."⁸⁷ Hamilton Rowan, secretary of the United Irishmen, had escaped from Newgate, where he was imprisoned for sedition, and had arrived in Philadelphia in July, 1795, a few weeks before his colleague, Wolfe Tone.⁸⁸ Another radical friend who was there was John Craig Millar, already mentioned, a companion of Muir's university days. He, Rowan says, "is concerned with a Scottish company who have made a large purchase of land here".⁸⁹ A man who was concerned with a land company may or may not have had money for an enterprise such as the rescue of Muir; but, if the conjecture of the Edinburgh *Advertiser* is correct and Rowan was responsible for the mission of the *Otter*, his part must have been that of inspirer and not financier. Muir knew Rowan's address, for he wrote direct to him from Havana on December 3, 1796;⁹⁰ and from the tone of Rowan's letter to his wife, telling of the receipt of Muir's, the fact that Muir had escaped from Sydney was news to neither Rowan nor his correspondent.⁹¹

As has been said, Muir and his trial had aroused much interest among the Americans. Thomas Paine was their hero; Muir, indicted on a charge of circulating Paine's works, became their hero too; and their country was an open port for those liberty-lovers who had lost their freedom and stolen it again. The spirit that was abroad of sympathy for the politically oppressed and of popular antipathy to the British government must have made it a good atmosphere into which to breathe the suggestion to rescue Thomas Muir. But on the other hand there is absolutely no indication in any of the numerous letters of Muir now brought to light, nor in any of his recorded statements or any of Dorr, that his escape was in any wise the result of previous planning by his friends. Perhaps the story may in part be due to remembrances of a letter which Muir received at Madrid, after his release from Cadiz, from a certain Captain Charles Stewart,

⁸⁷ Edinburgh *Advertiser*, LXVII, 109. Gerald and Skirving died as mentioned in note 35. Palmer completed his sentence and on his way home was wrecked on Guam, one of the Ladrones group, where he died in June, 1802; Margarot, a troublesome character, served two extra years, and returned to England in 1811, where he died in November, 1815.

⁸⁸ *Autobiography of Hamilton Rowan*, pp. 278, 282.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 200; see also note 52, above. Dr. Priestley, too, continued his friendship: we find him writing from Northumberland, Pennsylvania, to Theophilus Lindsey, Dec. 6, 1795, "I hope that you or Mr. Johnson pay my subscription of five guineas annually to" Palmer and Muir; Rutt, *Priestley*, II, 325. See also Belsham's *Lindsey*, p. 353.

⁹⁰ *Autobiography*, pp. 305, 316.

⁹¹ The news of Muir's escape was published in England in February, 1797, and Rowan's letter was dated Feb. 10, 1797, so that he could not have learnt of it from England.

who, having heard in New York of Muir's situation in Cadiz, had on arriving there "used the liberty of chartering a vessel" for the purpose of landing him in America, to the infinite pleasure of his friends in that country.⁹²

Perhaps it is in strictness no part of our subject to trace the fortunes of the *Otter* and her motley company beyond the time when Muir parted from them at Nootka in June, 1796, but the tale is a curious one.⁹³ On October 29 the *Otter* sailed into the harbor of Monterey, the first United States vessel to enter a Californian port. Dorr secured supplies from Governor Borica, but was refused permission to leave at Monterey some of his superabundant company of twenty-six, of whom sixteen had come from Boston, one from Nootka, the rest from Botany Bay.⁹⁴ Sailing out on November 6, the ungrateful captain put five men ashore that night, at a remote point in the bay, and the next night, at the point of a pistol, five more and a woman. Of the eleven, three were of the original crew, Andrew Lambert, carpenter, and his apprentice, of Boston, and a wig-maker from London. One was a Briton marooned at Nootka by his captain. The rest are reported as stowaways from Botany Bay, two of them sailors, one a carpenter, one a tailor, two blacksmiths, one of whom was a Philadelphia negro. The rest were from London, Liverpool, and Lincoln. The woman, Jane Lambert, of London, admitted that she was a transported convict, though in later testimony she constantly maintained that she was married to Andrew Lambert in Boston years before and had a daughter of thirteen living there in the care of grandparents. But as her age on this first mention is given as twenty-seven, and Lambert's as twenty-five, we are under no obligation to believe her.

Borica put his guests to work, at smithwork and carpentry, until finally, nearly a year later, he found a chance to send them to San Blas, where they arrived late in November, 1797. Then the papers, multiplied in the usual tedious manner of Spanish officials, and now reposing in the Mexican archives, show them journeying up to Mexico and from there to Vera Cruz, whence in July, 1798, most of them

⁹² Stewart (brother-in-law of the banker Meliss in Perth, on whom see *Autobiography of Mrs. Fletcher*, p. 27) to Muir, Cadiz, Oct. 26, 1797, enclosed in Muir to Talleyrand, 12 brumaire an VI. (Nov. 2, 1797), Arch. Aff. Etr., Corr. Pol., Espagne, 650, fl. 162, 209.

⁹³ Without giving specific references, it may be said that there are more than a hundred documents on the subject in the *expediente* of the *Otter* in Arch. Gen. Mexico, Prov. Int., VI., exp. 16. A few more have come from the State Papers or Provincial Records at Sacramento.

⁹⁴ Bancroft, *History of California*, I, 538-540. Dorr's son told Bancroft various tales of his father's troubles with these reckless adventurers.

are sent off to Havana. One had died, one had escaped as a stow-away on a galleon to Guayaquil. Andrew and Jane Lambert manifesting a willingness to become Catholics, and Peter Pritchard of Liverpool already such, are encouraged to remain; but while Andrew Lambert works steadily at his trade as a ship carpenter in Vera Cruz, Jane is a source of much trouble to the authorities, falling into habits of intemperance, and going away, for a cure apparently, and residing in the house of Don Juan Oquelli (O'Kelly) in Mexico and of Don Tomas Murphy in Jalapa, much respected citizens, who look out for her as well as they can. It is an interesting picture of humble life in Mexico at the time—the affectionate but illiterate letters which Lambert sends after her, written for him by a Spanish lady of much kindness but little orthography; the English-speaking Father Nicolas Arsdequi (Archdeacon) who received them into the church; the details of their finances, their journeyings, their progress in the catechism. But what most impresses one in their story is, as in the case of Muir, the ceaseless and minute vigilance with which the whole administration of New Spain, from the viceroy down, kept its eye upon all the doings of every foreigner, and struggled to preserve state and church from contaminating influences.

MARJORIE MASSON,
J. F. JAMESON,

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

HISTORY IN THE SCHOOL CURRICULUM

IT is doubtless known to many members of the American Historical Association that there was called into existence, a year or two ago, a Joint Commission on the Presentation of Social Studies in Schools, and that our society was represented on that commission by two members, Professors W. E. Lingelbach of the University of Pennsylvania and A. M. Schlesinger of the University of Iowa, while the national organizations representing economics, political science, sociology, and geography were also represented by two members each. The commission endeavored, as one preliminary to its work, to secure a consensus of expert opinion concerning the distinctive contributions of these various studies to the purposes connected with the presence of social studies in the curriculum of American schools. After extensive consultations of other teachers the commission has formulated a statement, printed in a leaflet, on the Distinctive Contributions of History, Economics, Political Science, Sociology, and Geography to a School Curriculum organized around Social Objectives. From this we extract, as of special interest to our readers, the preliminary sentence and the statement on the distinctive contribution of history, framed by the representatives of that study in co-operation with the other members of the Joint Commission.

If it be accepted that the school curriculum (indeed, the whole school life) should be organized around social objectives, it may be said that the purpose of that curriculum is to enable our youth to realize what it means to live in society, to appreciate how people have lived and do live together, and to understand the conditions essential to living together well; to the end that our youth may develop such abilities, inclinations, and ideals as may qualify them to take an intelligent and effective part in an evolving society.

The Distinctive Contribution of History

History deals with the whole past life of mankind and is as many-sided as life itself. History inevitably appeals differently to different persons. Some profit chiefly by the stimulus to their imagination; others broaden their horizon by a larger view of the world and its development; still others find their political understanding stimulated by more detailed study of the political and social problems of the past.

The distinctive contribution of history to a school curriculum organized around social objectives is the portrayal of human events and activities as they actually occurred; its guiding principles are continuity and development. Therefore these events and activities are not regarded as

isolated, unrelated, or of equal importance. Every condition or event is conceived to be related to something that went before and to something that comes after. Conditions and events are deemed important in so far as they serve to throw light upon some course of development. More briefly, then, a special and peculiar function of history is to trace development.

History places, and helps to explain, successive stages in the development of mankind. In the light of history our most valued social possessions are seen to be deeply rooted in the past and the world is viewed as undergoing a continuous process of adjustment and change. Furthermore, the study of successive civilizations, with their differences and similarities, promotes a more sympathetic understanding among individuals, groups, and peoples.

History, by creating a sense of perspective, gives an intelligent notion of those human activities, decisions, and achievements which lie behind our present-day institutions and problems. It makes intelligible the constant references to people and conditions of the past in literature, speeches, public discussions, and the daily press. It affords training in the collecting and weighing of evidence. It furnishes a body of materials for the other studies for comparison and construction.

History supplies the necessary background for an appreciation of much that is best in literature and art. It gives more interest to travel. It develops fair-mindedness by showing how loyal citizens have honestly differed on public questions. At the same time, it stimulates an intelligent patriotism by familiarizing young people with the history of their own country and its place in the world.

History is to society what memory is to the individual. It is the record of the accumulated experience of the past and serves as the key to the storehouse of human experience for the guidance of man in dealing with the problems of the present.

[Similar statements respecting the other studies follow.]

AN UNPOPULAR SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY VIEW OF MAGNA CARTA

DURING the past generation Magna Carta has been reinterpreted in many important respects. Much discussion, for one thing, has centred about the question as to what the barons sought and secured for themselves alone, and what for the commonalty of the realm. Bishop Stubbs was perhaps the last great authority to maintain the traditional view, which had been developing for centuries, that the movement was essentially popular in purpose and in result.

It is the collective people [he says] who really form the other high contracting party in the great capitulation,—the three estates of the realm, not it is true arranged in order according to their profession or rank, but not the less certainly combined in one national purpose, and securing by one bond the interests and rights of each other severally and of all together. The Charter contains a clause similar to that by which Henry I. tried to secure the rights of his subjects as against the mesne lords; but now the provision is adopted by the lords themselves for the security of fair and equal justice: . . . The barons maintain and secure the

right of the whole people as against themselves as well as against their master.

Then he cites various concessions to prove "that the demands of the barons were no selfish exaction of privilege for themselves" and "that the people for whom they acted were on their side" (*Constitutional History of England*, sixth ed., Oxford, 1903, I, 570, 571). As opposed to this standpoint, as is well known, scholars have come to believe that the altruistic motives of the barons, the degree of popular participation, and the extent of the concessions secured for those outside the baronial class have been greatly exaggerated. The most extreme and sensational expression of dissent from the long prevailing view was voiced by Mr. Edward Jenks in "The Myth of Magna Carta" (*Independent Review*, VI, 260-273, November, 1904). More moderate but nevertheless decided evidences of the new standpoint may be found of course in McKechnie's *Magna Carta* and the various writings of Professor George Burton Adams.

Owing to the fact that much of the distortion of the meaning and scope of Magna Carta was a seventeenth-century product, due to the efforts of Coke and the parliamentary leaders Hakewell, Eliot, Pym, and Hampden to sharpen a popular weapon to slash at the royal prerogative as exercised by James I. and Charles I., a dissenting voice in that very century, anticipating the trend of recent criticism in at least one particular, is perhaps worth quoting. The author is one William Cole, who describes himself as "A Lover of his Country", and who, July 12, 1659, published a spirited brochure with the castigating title of *A Rod for the Lawyers who are declared to be the Grand Robbers and Deceivers of the nation greedily devouring yearly many millions of the peoples money.*

He starts out by a vigorous attack on the existing laws, which marks his production as one of the interesting forerunners of Jeremy Bentham's *Fragment on Government* (1776).

Its the usual cry [he declares] amongst the Masters of Oppression the Lawyers, and ignorant people that know no better, that the Laws of England, as also the ways of executing them, are the safest and best in the World; and whosoever shall alter the said laws, or ways of executing them, will unavoidably introduce a mischief instead of a benefit. But to those it is answered, that the major part of the Laws made in this nation, are founded on principles of tyranny, fallacy and oppression for the profit and benefit of those that made them.

Coming to the point with which this note is more particularly concerned, he expresses himself as follows:

But some will say, that although we were conquered, yet your Noble Ancestors, by dint of sword in the Baron's War, regained their freedom,

and influenced the King to condescend to that famous Law, called Magna Carta.

For answer, know this, that when the nobles in those days found the King altogether inclined to his Minions, and Flatterers, and thereby made Laws to enslave the said nobles, as well as the commons[worse than they] had been before, they saw there was a necessity for them to stand up for their own priviledges, who being popular, what by fear and love, they engaged the commons with them in War, and took the King prisoner, forcing him to consent to all things that were necessary, to preserve themselves from the King's will, but never in the least acted from any love to the poor commons, but what they were absolutely necessitated, neither freed the said commons from the bondage they were in to themselves.

Who this advanced thinker, William Cole, may have been there is apparently no evidence to show. William Cole (1626-1662) who graduated from Oxford in 1650 was sufficiently versatile to combine the activities of botanist and notary public; but his university connection and his subsequent employment as secretary of Duppa, bishop of Winchester, would seem to preclude the idea that he could have spread broadcast, under his own name, views such as those quoted above. Another William Cole (1635-1716) evidently devoted himself exclusively to medicine. (For these two Coles, see *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, XI, 277, 278, citing respectively Wood's *Athenae Oxon.*, ed. Bliss, 1817, vol. III., cols. 621-622, and Wood's *Fasti Oxon.*, 1721, II, 132, 165.)

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

THE THREATENED PROSECUTION OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON UNDER THE SEDITION ACT BY THOMAS COOPER

THE fact that Alexander Hamilton was threatened with prosecution under the Sedition Act for the criticisms expressed in his famous letter on the public conduct and character of John Adams¹ seems entirely to have escaped the notice of his biographers and of writers on the election of 1800. The would-be prosecutor was Thomas Cooper,² himself a conspicuous victim of the Sedition Act,³ the story of whose efforts for the impartial administration of justice can be pieced out from fragments culled from the contemporary newspapers. The episode may be viewed seriously as an exposé of Federalist parti-

¹ *Works* (ed. Lodge), VI, 391-446.

² Cf. H. M. Ellis's brief but reliable account of Cooper's life in England, *South Atlantic Quarterly*, January, 1920, pp. 24-42; and the present writer's *The First Years of Thomas Cooper in America, 1794-1801*, *ibid.*, April, 1923.

³ *An Account of the Trial of Thomas Cooper, of Northumberland; on a Charge of Libel against the President of the United States; cf. Wharton, State Trials*, pp. 659-681.

zanship, or, preferably, may be more lightly regarded as a most delightful bit of political irony and a most audacious political manoeuvre.

Thomas Cooper, after an imprisonment of six months because of what seem to us to have been rather trivial criticisms of the President, was released from the Philadelphia prison in early October, 1800.⁴ By the twenty-fifth of the month at least, the Republicans of the city had seen the whole of Hamilton's letter or extracts from it.⁵ It must have been apparent to many of them that, whatever the purpose of his strictures may have been, the most conspicuous member of the Federalist party had damned the Federalist President more thoroughly than any of the Republicans had done. Only an audacious man, however, would have recognized the prosecution of Hamilton as even a remote possibility or would have thought of the threat of it as politically expedient. Cooper was nothing if not bold; to one who had in earlier years denounced and defied Edmund Burke⁶ the thought of an encounter with even the redoubtable Hamilton had no terrors. The letter he immediately recognized as an instrument supplied as by Providence for his hand.

By October 27 he was in New York, in pursuit of Hamilton. The visit was greeted with contemptuous comment in the Federalist press. The *New York Gazette*, for example, thus remarked upon it:

The famous Thomas Cooper is in town—Dr. Reynolds,⁷ accompanies him through our streets. A precious pair! It is said Cooper has come on for the purpose of commencing a prosecution against General Hamilton, for a libel on the President!!!—Cooper has an experimental knowledge of the nature of the sedition act, and would willingly see it put in force against one of the best friends of our government.⁸

It was also stated that he had called at the *Gazette* office and purchased a copy of Hamilton's letter, but it was vigorously denied that any conversation had been had with him. Perhaps this was the first copy of the entire letter which he had seen.

⁴ Cf. letter in *Philadelphia Gazette*, Oct. 13, 1800.

⁵ *Philadelphia Gazette*, Oct. 25, 1800; *Aurora*, Oct. 25, 27, 1800.

⁶ *Reply to Mr. Burke's Invective against Mr. Cooper and Mr. Watt in the House of Commons, etc.* (Manchester, 1792).

⁷ Dr. James Reynolds, who had been one of a group of Irish friends of Cooper's who had made an attack upon editor Wayne of the *Gazette of the United States* in his behalf, *Philadelphia Gazette*, Oct. 13, 1800. Reynolds had been involved in a riot in February, 1799; cf. *Gazette of the U. S.*, Feb. 11, 12, 21, 1799. Despite the similarity in name, he cannot be identified with the James Reynolds of the Hamilton-Reynolds affair. The name of Dr. James Reynolds first appears in the *Philadelphia directory* for 1799, p. 116. In none of the newspaper discussion of 1799 and 1800 is there any intimation of his connection with the earlier affair. He seems to have been a man of some education, whereas the other James Reynolds was grossly ignorant.

⁸ Quoted in *Philadelphia Gazette*, Nov. 1, 1800.

Meanwhile, a Republican mass-meeting had been held at Lovett's Hotel on October 27 "to congratulate Thomas Cooper, Esquire of Northumberland, on his emerging from *Chase's* repository of republicans", and toasts had been drunk to him as "the conspicuous victim of the Sedition Law, the friend of science, and the able advocate of universal liberty", and to the Irish, to Dr. Reynolds and to William Duane." The Federalist Philadelphia *Gazette* commented sarcastically upon the meeting,¹⁰ but the *Aurora*, whose editor had been toasted and whose republicanism was unmitigated, had an editorial of almost a column a few days later on Cooper's mission.¹¹ To this it gave unqualified approval, saying that Hamilton would have no cause to complain after his prosecution of Frothingham,¹² and that the Federalist party must swallow to the very dregs the cup they had administered to others. "Thanks are due to the respectable and much injured Thomas Cooper, for the noble and spirited firmness which he has displayed on this occasion."

For the moment, however, the would-be prosecutor was foiled: he had hoped to see Hamilton in New York, but found that he had departed for Albany. Nothing daunted, he despatched post-haste the following extraordinary letter, which one Philadelphia paper published under the heading "Precious Letter from a very modest Man"¹³ and of which another said, "A more preposterous affectation of regard for character . . . is not to be met with in the annals of Jacobinism".¹⁴

Sir,

I came to New York for the purpose of asking Gen. Hamilton, in person, whether he was the author of an attack on the character of President Adams, which bears his name; and to say that I mean to use that information for the purpose of instituting against you, Sir, a prosecution under the detestable act of Congress, commonly known by the name of the "Sedition Law".

Under this law, passed through the influence of a party, of which you are (and I think justly) regarded as the head, I have suffered six months tedious imprisonment, and paid a fine of 100 dollars.¹⁵ I therefore have a right to retaliate: I have a right to try the experiment,

¹⁰ *Aurora*, Nov. 5, 1800.

¹¹ Nov. 4, 1800.

¹² Nov. 7, 1800.

¹³ David Frothingham, convicted Nov. 16, 1799, on charge of libel against Hamilton: cf. Wharton, *State Trials*, pp. 649-651. He had charged Hamilton with an attempt to buy the *Aurora* and had insinuated that he had received "secret service money of the king of Great Britain" for this purpose.

¹⁴ *Gazette of the U. S.*, Nov. 20, 1800.

¹⁵ Philadelphia *Gazette*, Nov. 19, 1800; cf. *Aurora*, Nov. 20, 1800.

¹⁵ Misprint for 400 dollars.

whether *Republicanism* is to be the victim of a law, which *Aristocracy* can break through with impunity. There have been many petty offenders in this respect, among what is called the Federal party; but I have nothing to do with the Feno's,¹⁶ the Wayne's,¹⁷ and the Journeyman of Federalism. You are worth trying the experiment upon. Your energy and your talents have rendered you a conspicuous object of praise and blame.

I therefore have determined that in one way or other you shall be brought before the public on this account; and I did so far calculate on your character as to suppose, that you would not deny what you have really written and sanctioned with your name. I expect by your answer (directed to me at Lancaster, Pennsylvania) the same information which I should have hoped for personally. I came to town last night between 7 and 8 and sent to you immediately. I write this hastily at eight this morning to send by the stage. I shall purchase your pamphlet at Lang's, but make no use of that opportunity of prosecution till I hear from you, which I expect by return of post. The answer, I have no doubt, will be such as becomes your character.

I am your obedient servant,

THOMAS COOPER
Of Northumberland

To Gen. A. Hamilton,
at Albany.

If the writer of this letter seriously expected a reply from its recipient, the course which events took must have grievously disappointed him. Hamilton did not deign to answer it and apparently turned it over immediately to the Albany *Register* for publication. It was duly copied by both the Federalist and Republican press, and was commented upon both at the time and subsequently.¹⁸ So Cooper had at least the satisfaction of gaining considerable publicity and of advertising further the inconsistency of the party of the administration. But he was denied an extended controversy such as he had probably hoped for. Hamilton would engage in conflict on no such terms, or perhaps did not care to match pens with this particular antagonist on any terms whatsoever.

Meanwhile, the challenger had returned to Pennsylvania. Whether or not he went to Lancaster to lend a hand in the political affray at the state capital, as he seems to have intended, we do not know. Late in December he was writing from Northumberland to the *Aurora* to explain to all anxious democrats why Alexander Hamilton was yet at large. Personal affairs had for the time demanded his undivided attention, and well indeed they might. His wife had died shortly before his release from prison, but whether from in-

¹⁶ John Ward Feno, editor of the *Gazette of the U. S.* 1798-1800.

¹⁷ C. P. Wayne, Feno's successor.

¹⁸ Cf. *Gazette of the U. S.*, Nov. 24, 1800, copying about two-thirds of a column from the New York *Gazette*; and Nov. 25, editorial paragraph.

sensibility to grief, excessive ardor of political passion, or the hope of inducing forgetfulness of personal misfortune, he had almost immediately rushed headlong into the conflict. But there doubtless were personal readjustments which he could not longer postpone making, and while he was making them presidential electors had been chosen and the necessity for further campaigning against the Federalists was for the time removed.

In later years he looked back upon his activities in the campaign of 1800 and his sufferings for the sacred cause of freedom of speech with satisfaction; and he later gave Hamilton words of praise which he ever denied John Adams. For the moment, however, his vanity, which was excessive, was wounded by Hamilton's contemptuous disregard of him. Apparently Cooper had disquieted that distinguished gentleman not at all. Whatever his motives may have been in the first place, he had proceeded in entire seriousness and deadly earnest, and it seems unlikely that he was amused by the ultimate developments, as another man might well have been. The *Aurora* published his letter on the last day of the year. He had doubtless delivered himself of it with all the solemnity which befitted such an epilogue.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,

The melancholy occasion which called me to Northumberland has hitherto prevented my noticing the conduct of Gen. Hamilton. To the letter I sent him to Albany, I have received no answer; and I have sufficient reason to believe it was published by himself. I shall be grossly deceived if this will not furnish an additional reason to his friends to mistrust his judgment.

To Gen. Hamilton I owe no account of my future proceedings: but the public may desire, why this conspicuous offender against the *Sedition Law*—this Arch-defamer of our first magistrate, should not be called to account?—If this favourite law of the anti-republicans cannot protect the character of Mr. Adams—if General Hamilton, the vindictive prosecutor of Frothingham, can sin against the *Sedition Law*, and against the President with impunity, while republicans alone are subjected to its penalties—if no Attorney General is directed to prosecute, and the keen-eyed zeal of Judge Chase himself is closed upon the offence—what are we to think of the motives which produced this federal safeguard?

From any prosecution of mine general Hamilton is now safe. While there was any chance of Mr. Adams or Mr. Pinckney being called to the presidency, the experiment was worth trying,—whether the conduct of federal judges, and a federal jury, and a federal president towards general Hamilton, would have been similar to that which republicans have experienced, whose prosecution was directed by Mr. Adams, and conducted under the mild auspices of his honor Judge Chase!

But the hopes of aristocracy are no more! Neither the manageable Mr. Pinckney, nor the unmanageable Mr. Adams, is called to the presidency; and how either would have behaved on the conviction of general

Hamilton, cannot now be ascertained. I have no motive to proceed. Nor will I contaminate the administration of Mr. Jefferson by promoting the operation of a law, which he would disdain to use against the most virulent of his opponents.

Even were this not the case, I should have relinquished the prosecution of general Hamilton, after the ignorance he has shewn of what was due to his own character, and to mine. I lament that a man who might have rendered himself highly useful, and truly estimable, should not only degrade himself by gross violations of moral propriety, but become at length so insensible as he appears to be, to the dictates of common politeness. The experiment I wished to make was worth making. I thought Gen. Hamilton was an object worthy of the experiment. I was mistaken: no man has the character sufficient for the purpose, who from ignorance or irritation, from pride or peevishness, can put off the character of a gentleman. I am etc.

THOMAS COOPER.

In a speech on the Sedition Law in the House of Representatives in January, 1801, Harrison Gray Otis, in replying to the contention of Albert Gallatin that the failure of the magistrates to notice Hamilton's pamphlet indicated partizanship in the enforcement of the act, reminded the Pennsylvanian that in this particular case any designs which the government may have had were anticipated by the eagerness of democratic zeal.¹⁹ To have interfered with the "Northumbrian apostle of liberty" who rode post to New York to apply the law with his own hands, would have been most unseemly!

DUMAS MALONE.

THE WORKINGMEN'S PARTY IN MASSACHUSETTS, 1833-1834

THERE is danger in examining the events of an earlier period under the strong light of modern concepts, that the picture may become distorted. It is well illustrated in the case of the Workingmen's party in Massachusetts during the early 'thirties. Referring to the election of 1833, the authors of the most recent and comprehensive history of labor in the United States have said that more than a quarter of the Workingmen's vote was cast in the city of Boston and that it was impossible to tell how far the movement extended through the state.¹ There are two errors in this statement. Boston did not give one-fourth of the Workingmen's vote in 1833; nor is it impossible to discover how far the movement extended into the state. Two inferences, furthermore, may be drawn that are faulty in conception. Any conclusion that this labor movement represented an immobile factory population which formed a distinct industrial class is mistaken. No more easily can it be implied that

¹⁹ *Annals of Congress*, 6 Cong., p. 958.

¹ J. R. Commons and associates, *History of Labor in the United States*, I, 315.

the Workingmen's party was predominantly urban in character. There was discontent among the laboring people of Massachusetts in 1833 and 1834, but it was primarily the dissatisfaction of a rural population.

In the election of 1833 for governor the Workingmen's party secured 3459 votes throughout the state. To this total Boston contributed 519, hardly more than one-seventh. There was a vote of 727 for the Workingmen's candidate in Hampshire County—representing a far greater proportion of the voting population than his vote in Boston. Moreover, 1484 of the 3459 votes cast by Workingmen came from the western counties, the agricultural area of the Connecticut Valley. The Workingmen won ten towns in the state, six of which lay in the western part.²

To imply from the protests recorded in the newspapers and pamphlets of the 'thirties that there was a helpless and immobile industrial class, crowded into large urban manufacturing centres, is erroneous. Farmers, carpenters, masons, ship-caulkers, and all day-laborers objected to the twelve-hour day customary in those times. They clamored for more leisure in which they might cultivate other interests. They demanded an opportunity for education of themselves and their children that they might advance their position in society.³ Although the strike of carpenters and masons at Boston for a ten-hour day failed in 1830, the leaders would not be discouraged. They saw the grievances common to farmers, mechanics, and all laboring men in New England, and they began to agitate for united action. They called a convention to meet at Boston in February, 1832, to which delegates came not only from Massachusetts but Connecticut and Rhode Island also. At this convention they created the New England Association of Farmers, Mechanics, and Other Workingmen in order to promote the interests of the laboring class as a whole.

Because their capital liberated them from all manual labor, the rich Boston families who were developing cotton manufactures on the banks of the Merrimac River were particularly obnoxious to the New England Association. It was most anxious to win the laborers

² All election figures given in this paper are taken from the official reports deposited in the archives of the State House at Boston. Another 1000 votes were given to the Workingmen's candidate in Middlesex, Bristol, Plymouth, Norfolk, and Essex—all rural counties in distinction from the metropolitan area of Suffolk.

³ For wages, hours of labor, and factory statistics, see *Report on Manufactures*, Louis McLane, Secretary of the Treasury, 1832 (*House Doc. 308, 22 Cong., 1 sess.*). A study of the evidence there recorded will reveal the fact that there was an incentive for the Massachusetts farmer to go into the factories.

who were being drawn into those growing factories. They were told that they were rapidly descending to the "level of the slave". When they did not appear at the convention of 1833 in Boston, the delegates from New Haven lamented that "the operatives in the factories are already subdued to the bidding of the employers—that they are already sold to the oppressor".⁴

From such an account the reader of to-day might visualize a sorry picture of squalid factory conditions, of hopeless treadmills, of grinding machines that consumed human vitality as rapidly as they produced cotton cloth. He might be led to imagine an immobile factory population reproducing itself in crowded urban districts and huddled into depressing tenements. But conditions were much different in 1833 and 1834.

Massachusetts had exploited its water-power and had definitely become a manufacturing state, whose representatives in Washington were seeking protective tariffs. Its industries, however, were still in their infancy. A factory system was developing, but it was as yet on a very small scale. The town of Fall River in the southern corner of the state had some twenty-two companies engaged in cotton and iron manufacture, but their aggregate investment in real estate, machinery, and goods in process of manufacture was little more than \$1,000,000. They employed altogether about seven hundred men and boys and a similar number of women. There were hardly more than four thousand inhabitants in the town itself at this time. The manufacture of paper had begun in the Berkshire hills of western Massachusetts. The Crane and Carson mills at Dalton represented an investment approximately of \$35,000, and ten mills in the neighboring town of Lee, taken together, had a working capital of \$106,500. The manufacture of woolen goods also had made a start in the Berkshires. Three mills at Pittsfield had an investment of \$335,000 and employed 134 men and boys and 95 women. Similar enterprises were developing in the Connecticut Valley and in Worcester, Middlesex, and Essex counties to the north and west of Boston, wherever water-power sites were available. But companies with working capital of more than \$100,000 and with employment for more than one hundred men were rare.⁵

It was only in the factories at Waltham and Lowell, promoted by the Appletons, Lawrences, Lowells, and other Boston capitalists, that

⁴ Commons, *History of Labor*, I. 302-306.

⁵ McLane's *Report*, I. 156, 144, 134. For comment on the cotton business in Fall River, see the letter of N. B. Borden, Mar. 21, 1832, I. 73; for Fall River industries, I. 164. For its population, see *Mass. Census*, 1875, I. 733-751.

the forerunners of modern industries could be found. The capital of each company approached the million mark; its number of employees averaged over five hundred. Stimulated by the success of these mills, the town of Lowell grew from a population of 6,474 in 1830 to 20,796 in 1840. It was just beginning to take on the character of an industrial city.⁶

When, therefore, the managers of the Workingmen's party presented candidates for the state elections in the early thirties, there was no distinct laboring class to respond to their appeal. The small industries of Fall River and Taunton in Bristol County, of the Berkshire Hills and the Connecticut Valley, just emerging from the household stage, were still dependent for labor upon the neighboring farms. To supply the larger needs of the mills in Lowell, the owners had to establish a system of boarding-houses as temporary homes for a transient laboring population, men and girls, who came from the farms to secure better wages, but who had not broken the ties that bound them to the outlying rural districts. According to one who grew up in the factory life of Lowell, the new industries became a sort of "Yankee El Dorado" to which farmers' daughters came often "to earn money to complete their wedding outfit" and single men "to get money for an education, or to lift the mortgage from the home-farm".⁷

Factory operatives were not represented at the convention of the New England Association in 1833 because they had not become conscious that they were a separate industrial class, "chained to the machines". They were fully represented by the farmer delegates, who voiced that suspicion of urban capitalists common among all plain country folk.

If then the New England Association and its political descendant, the Workingmen's party, were not representative of an urban and industrial proletariat in Massachusetts, what classes did they represent? The Workingmen's movement was preponderantly a rural and agrarian party, with an urban complement of carpenters, masons, and ship-caulkers—the "mechanics" of those days. It was the radical wing of the Democratic party—itself primarily a "country party" opposed to the wealthier conservative elements, both urban and rural, which made up the Whig party led by Daniel Webster.

Chafing under the control of conservative Democrats in Boston, this radical wing of the Democratic party felt strong enough during

⁶ McLane's *Report*, I, 340; U. S. *Census*, 1900, vol. I, pt. 1, pp. 430-437.

⁷ Mrs. Harriet J. Robinson, *Loom and Spindle, or Life among the Early Mill Girls*, p. 62. For other comment on the factory system at Lowell, see the bibliography in V. S. Clark, *History of Manufactures in the United States* (1916).

the two years 1833 and 1834 to break from the party and support a candidate of its own for the governorship.⁸ Samuel C. Allen of Northfield in the Connecticut Valley, a graduate of Dartmouth and former Congregationalist minister, appeared as a leader who could express the desires of "those of hard hands and sound hearts".⁹ He declared the platform of the Workingmen's party in a public letter on September 28, 1833, and immediately received the nomination for governor from a caucus of workingmen in Charlestown.

The Workingmen's party took on its industrial and class tinge indirectly, from hostility to the city and the wealthy classes who were promoting manufactures in the state. This feeling is illustrated in the case of Hampshire County, where the movement was strongest. The Hampshire Manufacturing Company at Ware, a corporation with an investment amounting to nearly \$500,000, had bought the property of a defunct local concern which had met with disaster "better understood in State Street, Boston, than in the country". According to the federal investigator: "No profits have been made by the manufacture of cotton in the county of Hampshire. The great benefit which has resulted from the establishment of cotton factories, has accrued to the country, and in no instance to the capitalist, unless where he has purchased at an immense sacrifice from those who founded them, and were crushed by their own creations." It is an easy inference from this report that Boston capital was taking up bankrupt concerns. From the point of view of the inhabitants, urban wealth was invading and exploiting local resources. It was but a step further for the native population to consider the wages of mill-hands as small in comparison with the investment of the owners, to contrast the twelve-hour day of the wage-earner with the leisure of the stockholder. With such opinions the people of Hampshire may have gone to the polls; but, while Allen received 727 votes from Hampshire County in 1833, not a single vote was given him in Ware. There evidently was no immobile factory population in the town itself to vote the Workingmen's ticket. At the same time, rural dislike of urban domination certainly was manifest.

The situation in Bristol County, south of Boston, was very similar. As has been shown above, industries aggregating a million of capital investment and employing about seven hundred men and boys were located in Fall River. It would be natural to expect a labor

⁸ My study of Jacksonian Democracy in Massachusetts from 1824 to 1848 is soon to be published. The manuscript is now in the Harvard College library.

⁹ J. B. Eldredge to G. Bancroft, Sept. 20, 1834. Bancroft Papers, Mass. Hist. Soc.

vote to appear in this town, if anywhere; but Allen received only 48 votes in 1833 at Fall River. Throughout the county he was given 312. Judging from these facts, one can hardly say that there was in Bristol an urban industrial class, self-conscious and distinct from the farming and seafaring population.¹⁰

Although the Workingmen again in 1834 endeavored to hold aloof from the regular Democratic party, they could not prevent the Democrats from appropriating their candidate, W. W. Thompson, for lieutenant-governor. In this year Allen received only 2606 votes; but again the bulk of the Workingmen's vote was cast in the rural counties of Hampshire, Franklin, Bristol, and Middlesex. Allen's following had begun to disintegrate and return to the ranks of the old party. When the Workingmen perceived that the rural Democrats were getting control of the organization and that Democratic campaign speeches resounded with familiar phrases, they were prone to respond and give up their useless effort to stand apart. Allen abandoned his candidacy for the governorship and became an aspirant for position in the Democratic organization.¹¹

ARTHUR B. DARLING.

¹⁰ McLane's *Report*: Massachusetts Archives. In 1834 Allen received 6 votes in Fall River and 306 throughout the county of Bristol. Taunton, with a population of 6,042, had cotton industries with working capital of \$694,000, which employed 486 men, 130 boys, and 495 women. Taunton gave Allen 41 votes in 1833 and 70 in 1834. See McLane's *Report*, I. 129, for the whaling industry of New Bedford.

¹¹ A comparison of the elections of 1834 and 1835 in the towns with the largest significant Workingmen's vote shows that they were reabsorbed into the Democratic party. See Bancroft's address in 1835, *Boston Statesman*, Oct. 17, 1835, and Morton's letters to Bancroft, Sept. 9, Oct. 29, 1835, Mass. Hist. Soc.

Allen was a delegate to the Democratic rally on Bunker Hill, July 4, 1837. See *Boston Advocate*, July 12, 1837, and his letter to Bancroft, Jan. 27, 1838, Mass. Hist. Soc.

DOCUMENTS

Letters of Robert Biddulph, 1779-1783

[THE following letters are placed at the disposal of the *Review* by the kindness of the late Lord Biddulph, a descendant of their writer's brother. Robert Biddulph (1761-1814), son of Michael Biddulph of Ledbury in Herefordshire, after the sojourn in America recorded in these letters, followed Lord Cornwallis to India, made some money there through government contracts,¹ became a banker in London, and was M. P. for Herefordshire 1796-1802, and for Denbigh 1806-1812.

Alderman Thomas Harley (1730-1804), a rich banker, in whose interest Robert Biddulph went out to America, had been lord mayor of London in 1767-1768, and was a privy councillor, and M. P. for the city of London 1761-1774, and for Herefordshire 1770-1782. Since before the beginning of the war Harley and Henry Drummond had had a contract for paying the British army in America with foreign gold; the profits which they shared from this contract are said to have amounted to £600,000.² Late in 1776 they sent out Gordon and Crowder to examine and adjust their accounts with the deputy paymaster general. From November, 1779, we see Gordon, Crowder, and Biddulph figuring as the agents in America of the two contractors; after the middle of 1781, it is Gordon, Biddulph, and Gordon.³

Young as Biddulph was, it is thought that his remarks have interest and value as recording the contemporary observations of one whose point of view was neither military nor political, and that they may profitably be read in connection with Judge Jones's *History of New York during the Revolutionary War* or Ramsay's and McCrady's accounts of the Revolution in South Carolina. An introduction has been supplied by the Hon. Violet Biddulph; the annotations are by the editor of the journal.]

¹ Ross, *Cornwallis*, III, 23.

² *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; Andrews, *Guide, Public Record Office*, II, 84, 86, 247. On Feb. 2, 1780, there was delivered to the House of Lords "An Account of Spanish and Portuguese Coins purchased by Messrs. Harley and Drummond for Use of the Army in N. America". *Lords Journal*, XXXVI, 22, 28; Andrews and Davenport, *Guide*, p. 268. On the system of army pay then prevailing, see Fortescue, *History of the British Army*, III, 510-514.

³ Hist. MSS. Comm., *Report on the American Manuscripts in the Royal Institution*, vols. I-III., *passim*.

THESE letters were written by Robert Biddulph, a youth of eighteen, who went out to America during the War of Independence. He was one of the large family of a Herefordshire squire, and the letters, which date from 1779 to 1783, are addressed chiefly to his father and mother. It appears that he was given his start in life by the old friend of his father, Thomas Harley, brother to the fourth earl of Oxford. He was to be a partner of a firm in America which acted for Mr. Harley, in connection with contracts for the British army, but he states that he is not to have anything to do with "Mr. Harley's trade".⁴

Mr. Harley, writing to the father on April 2, 1779, says: "That his youth may not be brought against him, I have passed him for twenty years old, he must supply that deficiency by discretion. . . . The Firm . . . are to find your son in Board and Lodgings, and to pay him the first year £200, the second £400, and the 3rd year he is to have 1-3 of the Profits of the busyness with them, and to bear his Proportion of the Expences of the House."

Robert expressed himself well pleased with these arrangements in the letter which he wrote to his father from London, and started for Portsmouth, where he was to secure his passage, full of hope as to his future prospects. He was to accompany Admiral Arbuthnot's expedition, which was going out with reinforcements for Sir Henry Clinton, the commander-in-chief then at New York, and says, "the ships appointed to go are the *Europe*, Admiral Arbuthnot, the *Russell*, Drake, and the *Resource*. I think I shall go in the *Russell*." Admiral Arbuthnot he describes as "for his age one of the pleasantest men I ever saw. I think he is near seventy".

He writes on April 7, 1779: "I was all yesterday in getting the money on board the *Europe*, but never saw so much riot and Confusion; the sailors call it the 'Golden Europe'. . . . It is supposed our fleet will consist of 150 sail", but in the end it was more than double that number. Later it was announced that Lord Cornwallis was going to America, and that another ship would be appointed for him and his suite.

Letters respecting the voyage are omitted. It was marked by many delays, by a diversion toward the Channel Islands caused by rumors respecting the French fleet, by the usual monotony, and by much sickness, especially an outbreak of jail fever, due to men taken from the London prisons.

⁴ Alderman Harley also had large contracts for the supply of clothing to the army. These, to the son of a landed squire of that period, would naturally seem less genteel than dealings with Spanish and Portuguese gold and silver.

It was not until August 22 that the *Russell*, which had been detached from the fleet on account of her sickness, anchored outside Sandy Hook. On the following morning, Robert Biddulph with three others sailed up the Narrows in a sloop, but, tide and wind failing them, took to a small boat, and rowing up the East River, got into Wall Street about ten o'clock at night.

At the time Admiral Arbuthnot's fleet arrived off the coast of America, there was a lull in the campaign, and such operations as had taken place recently were not of much military importance, but the season was now too far advanced to permit Sir Henry Clinton making use of the reinforcements for any fresh undertaking in the North. The headquarters of his army were at New York, and it was there that Robert was quartered for the next seven months.

VIOLET BIDDULPH.

NEW YORK, Aug. 27, 79 . . . I cannot give you any other Acct. of this town than that the greatest part of it is burnt down . . .⁵

NEW YORK, Aug. 31st, 1779 . . . The Army in general is upon this Island, only the Guards and Hessians in town; they expect the first Expedition to be towards the So'wds; the transports are now collecting. This Coast swarms with American Privateers to such a Degree that you must not wonder if you do not receive many Letters, and our want of Frigates so great that they have their own way entirely. Nothing here but Stores full of Goods, which sell very cheaply by wholesale, but not the least thing to be had under a dollar separately. Since I have been here I have not been able to do much, being almost eat up by the Mosquitos, but have great Hopes 2 or 3 frosty Nights will destroy them all. . . I am extremely happy my Brother did not carry out his Intention of coming here any farther. You cannot go out of this Island with Safety, and all the Country so much uncultivated, as would afford him very little Satisfaction. . . We have no prospect of ever making up our Affairs in this Country with any Eclat, and as we have just received Intelligence of a Declaration of War both with France and Spain, cannot expect to remain here much longer. The Cry in England upon the Receipt of bad News used to be, "We are not yet rous'd, its allways so at the Beginning of a War". If its possible to rouse them soon this must do it, and the Exertions that Country is capable of making for a Year or two, will determine its fate for ever. I suppose this will stop all Proceedings here, and that we shall think it Sufficient to take Care of ourselves. We are very happy in a Naval Commander, who has made several very good, tho' not very popular, Regulations, and, as the Phrase is now, is not afraid of a Bashaw [?]. We hear Sr. Chas: Hardy has sail'd with 32 Sail of the Line⁶ and that the french fleets are out, all we have to hope is that they may have a fair meeting—we must now either sink or swim. . . The Ruins of the town and the State of uncertainty in which the Inhabitants are is very melancholy, they have now been so long used

⁵ Fires of Sept. 21, 1776, and Aug. 3, 1778.

⁶ Hardy, with the Channel fleet, was at this time confronting in the Channel the combined fleets of France and Spain, but no general engagement took place.

to it that they say they sh'd not know how to live in times of Peace, especially the Ladies who have all set their Hearts upon going to England. . . I cannot find anything for my Brothers and Sisters to remember me by, but excuse me to Ann and Harriott for not sending them either Parrots or Monkeys with which this Country fortunately does not abound. . . There are plenty of Peaches here, with wh. they feed their Hogs,⁷ indeed they are good for nothing else, being in general like a bad Apricot. The Apples are very inferior to ours. . .

NEW YORK, Sept. 4. I think Great Britain cannot maintain this Country much longer and never conquer it. . . Among other things which will prevent a Conciliation, the contempt every Soldier has for an American is not the smallest. They cannot possibly believe that any good Quality can exist among them. . . The Manners of the People, I am not from my own Knowledge capable of speaking of, for the few I have seen, they are inquisitive and hypocritical. This Morning I rode out to Bunkers Hill,⁸ we too well know the fate of the British troops there; it has a descent on every side, and a formidable Battery of Guns. A Yankee who was walking there, asked me if I came from England, whether in the last fleet. He then told me that the spot was Bunkers Hill, but as he seem'd to have more veneration for the Place than I had, I left him to his meditations. On this Island there is nothing to be seen but monuments of Contention, and Examples of the Change a Country is capable of by being the Seat of War. . . Ld. Rawdon has given up his Command to the sorrow of the whole Army, Sr. H. C.⁹ excepted.

[On Oct. 7 he wrote to a friend that] The Season has been very unhealthy, 2/3 of the Army have been sick, the Guards excepted, who are almost constantly drunk. . . The Weather now begins to be comfortable and one can walk ab't without melting. I am apprehensive we shall find the other extreme and the more so as we are told there is not a week's fuel in the Garrison.

Oct. 9th. The present quiet State of the Army and the scarcity of Occurrences in a Place so much talk'd and thought of as this, must be my Excuse for the Barrenness of my Letters. . . Indeed the State of Europe so much engrosses our Attention, that (as we have no great Inclination to act) we do not much think of our own Affairs. . . The Case is here that, if you ask for News, it is perfectly understood that you mean from England, the West Indies, or concerning a fleet,¹⁰ which was some Time (ten days) ago, said to have been seen off the Bahama Islands steering for this Place. At that time an Expedition was going forward under the Command of Ld. Cornwallis of 3,000 men which, tho' hardly out of the Hook, were order'd back again and have been disembarked.¹¹

⁷ Cf. *Journal of Jasper Danckaerts*, pp. 67, 68.

⁸ The British in New York gave that name to Bayard's Hill (near where Grand and Centre streets now cross), on which the Americans had constructed a redoubt before evacuating the city. No engagement had occurred there. The name seems to have deceived the newcomer.

⁹ Sir Henry Clinton. Lord Rawdon did not at this time give up his command.

¹⁰ That of Count d'Estaing.

¹¹ Cornwallis sailed Sept. 24, with instructions to insure the safety of Jamaica, then, if possible, to take New Orleans, and finally to join Clinton at Savannah, but he was soon recalled by Clinton. *Cornwallis Corr.*, I. 42; *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, VIII. 61, 64, citing letters of Clinton.

Our naval Force of 6 Sail of the Line are formed in the Narrows in a Crescent, and the Adm'l is on board his own Ship. Transports etc. have been carried down to sink upon the Bar, if the said fleet sh'd attempt to visit us. We are perfectly happy in our Adm'l and quite at ease whether they come or not. We have just now heard that Stony Point upon the North River, the place where Col. Johnson was surprised,¹² is invested by the Rebels, and a Battery erected wh. has obliged the ships in the River to cutt away their Moorings. What may be the consequence, time will only shew. The Dilligence with which the Fortifications and all the works near this Town and upon Long Island have been repair'd, and the many new ones which have been constructed, looks much more like defensive than offensive—indeed the Season of the Year is rather advanced to begin a Campaign. Our whole hopes rest upon the fleet under Sr. Chas. Hardy, and it is not possible that anything but the total subdiction of this Country sh'd interest us so much as his Success. I have no doubt if he could beat the fleet at home, and Byron¹³ that in the W. Indies, that the troops in this Country would be either order'd Home or to the Spanish Settlements, as the whole World must have seen the folly of attacking it by Land; whereas Cruisers upon the Coast would entirely cutt off the Communication between this and any other Nation.

We are very happy in having Provisions for 60,000 men now in the Garrison for 6 months. The Spirit that seems to show itself in England will render it impregnable against all attempts of Invasion. If there is no other consequence from raising Regiments, there will be this at Least, that you will have fewer Thieves. . . This Country has been very unhealthy this last Summer and still continues so. . . The Army have been very sickly.

NEW YORK, Nov. 7, 1779. No public event except the Evacuation of Rhode Island has taken place; the Loss of Georgia¹⁴ and the *Experiment* (M. W.)¹⁵ are talked of, tho' without much hope of the contrary it may be otherwise. Sir Charles Hardy and his fleet are our only hopes; the advanced State of the season and the uncertainty of our situation forbids any Enterprise from hence. . . The confin'd state of the Army does not admit of my giving to you any account of the Country. There is no part of the world so extensive which makes excuse for the very different accounts you must have heard of it. . .

NEW YORK, Dec. 17th, 79. The News from Georgia being now fully confirmed will, with all its particulars, be seen in the News papers—as I imagine it will be esteem'd of some Consequence. The Army which has been quiet all the Summer is now embark'd for an Expedition, which, on Account of the Season of the Year, must be for the Southward. The

¹² The storming of Stony Point, and the capture of the British troops there under Lieut.-Col. Henry Johnson, had been effected in the night of July 15-16.

¹³ Vice-Admiral John Byron, the poet's grandfather. He had won no success against d'Estaing in the West Indies, and indeed at this date had already returned to England.

¹⁴ Newport was evacuated Oct. 25. Georgia was not lost; the siege of Savannah was raised Oct. 18.

¹⁵ Man-of-war. The *Experiment*, 50, Sir James Wallace, bound with a convoy from New York to Savannah, and carrying specie to the amount of 150,000 piastres, was captured by a portion of d'Estaing's fleet. Clowes, *Royal Navy*, IV.

Commander in Ch'f and Ld Cornwallis both go, the former intends going Home as soon as anything is done that will make him welcome. By the next Ships you may expect something very pleasant; and will be inform'd of the Events of this Expedition before we shall. This Port is effectually block'd up for the Winter. We have had some very Cold weather for this last Week, and much Snow, which is very agreeable to those who are fond of Sleighing—an Exercise only calculated for American Constitutions. If this place was actually besieged, it would not be more confin'd than it is at present, nobody thinks of stirring out of it. The ensuing Winter will be a very dull one, as we are garrison'd by Hessians, who, tho' they all speak English, do not make their Way among the Inhabitants who are sociable people and great talkers. I think those who are going to the So'wd very lucky—they will get into a fine warm Climate instead of being starved at New York. The 26th¹⁶ who are now going Home have been in this Country 13 years, few of the officers and none of the men remain. . . . Most of my Acquaintance are going in this Fleet, but I do not see any Body who does not wish to return. . . .

NEW YORK, Mar. 24th, 80. The *Russell* arrived here on the 22nd and brought Intelligence of the Health of the Troops, which were within one Mile of Charleston; they have had very remarkable Luck. No less than 5 Ships founder'd at Sea without the Loss of a Man; they very soon expect to be in possession of it. The Navy has not been so lucky having entirely lost the *Defiance* of 64 guns. She ran on Shore on the Bar of Tybee, nothing is saved out of her but the Men. The Com'r in Chief has signified to us by Gen'l Robertson that one of us should attend the Army; Mr G.¹⁷ and myself intend to comply with his Desire. This Scheme has long been in Agitation and will take place in ab't a Week; it is what I very much wished for. . . . The Expedition [sail'd] to the So'wd on the 26th.¹⁸ No Ship left or enter'd this port till the 29th Feby. We have experienced the coldest Winter ever known in this Country, which will easily appear to any Body that know this place if they can believe the Story. The North River which runs at the rate of 5 Knots an Hour was shut for 46 days between this Town and Paulus Hook, which was never known before to be frozen. Many thousand people passed over at different Times, myself among others. Soon after, the river was frozen to Staten Island, when 150 Sleighs passed to the Troops there with provisions and returned on the Ice. During this Time we were in the greatest distress for wood; sometimes the troops were obliged to eat their Meat raw, no fuel being deliver'd. All this is now over and nobody thinks of the Hardship; from Hence we shall not want Fire. An Embarkation is now on foot of 3,000 Men, said to be commanded by Lord Rawdon; tho' their Destination is as yet unknown, it is generally supposed they are intended to join the Army. This Expedition will determine the fate of America; as this is known, they cannot but succeed.

This day a Ship arriv'd from the W. Indies which gives an Acco't of 6 French Line of Battle Ships being block'd up in Prince Ruperts bay in the Island of Dominica by Adm'l Parker,¹⁹ those who know that

¹⁶ Cameronians, Lord Adam Gordon colonel.

¹⁷ Gordon.

¹⁸ Dec. 26, 1779. The events of the siege can be followed by means of the diary of Capt. Peter Russell, *Am. Hist. Rev.*, IV. 478-501, and other sources.

¹⁹ It was rather in the roadstead of Basseterre, Guadeloupe. La Motte-Picquet escaped.

Island say they cannot escape, and that if they are taken the whole Island must fall with them. We are much in want of some Success to keep up the Spirits of the Empire.

NEW YORK, March 28th. The Expedition to the Southward are all safe within one mile of Charlestown, and in Expectation of being in possession of it in a few days. . . [We] intend going in about a week; we expect to go with the *Rainbow* of 44 guns, a fine Ship, and as the Season is very favourable, we have every Expectation of a pleasant Voyage. I wrote by the *Solcay's* fleet which sail'd on Dec. 23rd, since wh. time no Ship has yet left this port for England. . . A fleet is collecting which I suppose we shall Convoy, this is the most dissagreable part of the Story, but absolutely necessary. . . The whole Army is orderd to be ready to take the field. General Knyphausen is Com'r in Chief and very much beloved.

CHARLESTOWN, May 14th, 80. We are at lenth in possession [of this place] after much Trouble, but no considerable Loss.²⁰ We went on board the *Rainbow* on the 3rd of April and lay at Sandy Hook till the 7th, when we sail'd as Convoy to about 30 ships etc. On the 18th we anchord off Charlestown Bar and left the Ship to get up to Town, which we were in Hopes was nearly taken. The Army were then carrying on their Approaches on Charlestown Neck at the Distance of 200 Yards from the Rebell Works, every Hour getting nearer. We remained on the Neck till the 22nd when the Admiral was pleased to order a Transport in Stono River for our Reception, which we were going to take possession of, when Capt. Chads (Agent for Transp'ts)²¹ took us on board his Ship where we remained till Yesterday. . . I shall cutt my Story short by saying that Fort Moultrie^{21a} on Sullivan's Island, having on the 6th fallen into the Hands of the Seamen and Marines under Capt. Hudson, the 8th [and 9th?] passed in flags of [truce?] till 9 o'clock at Night, when an incessant firing commenced which lasted all Night. On the 11th the town capitulated and on the 12th the British troops took possession of the Gate. . . The Number of Prisoners is 7000. I had the pleasure to see the 13 Stripes doused and the Union hoisted in its Stead. On the 13th we got into town by a pass as every thing is as yet unsettled, and have wrote our Name upon the Door of a very good House, where I slept as well as if I had been the Owner of it 20 Years. Genl. Leslie who commands here²² has been very obliging in inviting us to his Table till we are settled, which, if we do not change our House, cannot be long. I never was so much disappointed in any place as this. At the Distance of a few Miles the town makes a magnificent appearance; when you are in, it is much inferior to New York. The Building is very irregular and as many different plans as there are Houses, which in general are elegantly furnished and square, with a large Hall and passage thro' for the Benefit of the Air. On the side, Piazzas. On the disagreable Side of the Matter, the Streets are not paved and 6 Inches deep in Sand, which the smallest Breath of air raises in a Cloud. Without any, the Heat is intollerable. At Night a heavy Dew falls; In short the Houses are very good and you must keep to them. Mr G. and Myself have been

²⁰ Lincoln surrendered May 11.

²¹ Capt. Harry Chads, R. N.

^{21a} Moultrie.

²² Major-Gen. Alexander Leslie.

perfectly well and have determined to make ourselves at Home. . . About Hot House plants of which the Woods are full. I will send a collection from Hence, and, if I can get it carried, a Myrtle as big as an Elm. In my rides in the Woods, I see numbers of Curiosities in the Botanic Way which are lost upon me, but all their Charms could not compensate for the *Black, Rattle, Water and Thunder Snakes.*

CHARLESTOWN, June 7th, 1780. I wrote you a few lines by the *Persicus* and should have given you a more particular acc't if I had it in my Power. I believe if one half of the Officers who were present were questioned as to particulars, they would appear very ignorant. In such times every man attends a little to himself, and does not much Care from whence a Ball comes when it is fairly passed him. . . .

CHARLESTOWN, Aug. 26th, 1780. I have sent all my News to my Father so shall trouble you no farther than bye Congratulating you upon our Success. Good News (tho' it is the property of bad) will not, I hope, come Single, and I hope for the Counterpart of it from Europe. . . The Peace of this Country is fully established, but there is such a fund of Hatred and Animosity in the Hearts of the People, as Time only can extinguish. The men being Prisoners do not dare to speak out, but the Women make full Amends for their Silence, they amuse themselves by teaching their Children the principles of rebellion, and seem to take Care that the rising generation should be as troublesome as themselves. . . The only good thing here is fruit in great Plenty, Grapes, Figs, Peaches, Melons in perfection, Pines, etc. This does not make amends for being burnt alive all the Summer. I had much rather be in Herefordshire among the Apples, than all the finest Productions of this Climate. But I expect to see it one day or other. . . .

Now was I in England, I declare it I have not a single Story, worth the Hearing of any honest Man who might stare at me for having been over-sea. But Invention, Fiction and Embellishment are laudable for the good of our Country, then surely for one's own good, so I need not hesitate in Cases of Emergency. . . .

CHARLESTOWN, Aug. 27th. . . Lt. Cornwallis left Town on the 10th and arrivd at Campden on the 14th. He was inform'd of a large Army under Genl. Gates, within a few Miles of him, and determined to fight them. On the 15th he heard they were reinforced by 1500 Men. This did not incline him to change his resolution. He march'd on that Night, and met the Army coming to attack him. Both Parties form'd without Interruption, and lay upon their Arms till daylight. The Action then commenced and lasted ab't an Hour, when the Rebels gave way. The Cavalry under Col. Tarleton charg'd them, pursued their Remains for 22 Miles, killing great Numbers. The Number of Prisoners is not known, upwards of 1000 were left dead upon the field. This Victory, the greatest and most important to this Country, was obtain'd by 1800 Men over 6,400.²³ Genl. Gates, finding the destruction of his Army inevitable, left the field with a few Officers before the Charge of the Cavalry. Genl. Du Kalb was taken wounded and since dead. Capt. Ross goes Home with

²³ The figures given for the British agree with those stated by Cornwallis in his official report, *Cornwallis Corr.*, I. 402. As for Gates's force, his adjutant general, Col. Otho H. Williams, states from official figures collected that morning that "the numbers of rank and file present fit for duty was exactly 3052", Appendix B in Johnson's *Greene*, I. 493.

this Intelligence. I sh'd not say *this*, as the particulars are purposely suppressd, lest they shd reach you any other Way than by Authority. The Army made no Doubt of Ld. C's retreating before them, or if he sh'd hazard an Action, of cutting him to Pieces—but good fortune and the Courage of British Soldiers have prevented this. Had they succeeded at Campden, this Town would in all Probability have been in their Possession, as our internal Enemies would have been as active as the external ones. All the Baggage, Stores, Artillery and Ammunition are taken. The Prisoners on parole in town are this day put into the Provost; I imagine found guilty of some designs of Hostility. Another Army was marching against Savannah, with whom Cols. Innes and Fergusson fell in; the only particulars known here are the total defeat of the Rebels, and Col. Innes being wounded.²⁴ Our Success does not end here. On the return of the Army to Campden they were inform'd that Genl. Sumpter with 1,100 men had proceeded on this side. The gallant and fortunate Tarleton was just after him with 200. Genl. Sumpter had the precaution to take every Man, Woman and Child with him, that no Intelligence might remain to trace him. On the 18th Tarleton saw a Boy, and pretending to be Rebels (having a green Uniform) expressed great Fear of the British Troops. He was told, that none had been there, but on the other Side a Hill at a small Distance he wd meet some friends. He found them (Sumpter) on the other Side dressing their Dinners, and immediately dashing among them got Possession of their Arms, killed 150, took 300, and drove the Rem'r into the River. They had placed only one Centinel, who fired on their Approach, and kill'd Capt. Campbell, a very valuable officer. Genl. Sumpter is killed.²⁵ I expect to find that the french Fleet made a part of this grand Plan, but do not doubt that our Fleet in Case of an Engagement will make as good a Figure as the Army. The Admiral is no fresh Water Sailor.

This Success has put us all in great Spirits. If Lord Cornwallis had staid in Town another day, I might be writing at this present Time under Lock and Key. The great Confidence the Army place in him, will enable him to carry the World before him. It is reported his Horse was shot. Ld. Rawdon was second in Command, and is as universally esteem'd as he is known. But so young an Officer would hardly have hazarded the only 1800 Men we have, against 6,400. . .

CHARLESTOWN, Aug. 30th 1780. . . All their Stores, Baggage, Cannon, Ammunition, and General Gates' private Papers are taken. Among them some Letters from Prisoners on Parole in this Town have been found. I suppose promising their Assistance in Case this place sh'd be invested, as the principal people have been taken up, and are now on board a Ship, in order to be sent to St. Augustine. . . A Ship from the W. Indies this day tells a strange Story of 60,000 Men under Ld. Geo. Gordon attempting to seize the Bank. He says the Guards kill'd 500 and put their leader in the Tower. It is not believed.

CHARLESTOWN, Oct. 14th 1780. . . The Army in and near New York are at present quiet. The Fleet under Admiral Arbuthnot are before the Harbour of Rhode Island. Sr. Geo. Rodney is at New York. By the *Iris* (who for some reason carried no Letters) we learn that Genl. Arnold has gone over to Sr. H. Clinton, and that Col. André, (our Adj-

²⁴ Engagement at Musgrave's Mills, Aug. 18; the British and Tories were defeated.

²⁵ Engagement at Fishing Creek, Aug. 18; Sumpter was not killed.

tant General) is taken Prisoner. They had corresponded some Time, when Col. André went out in Disguise to Arnold, and returning, having obtained plans of their Camp etc, with Arnold's pass, was taken by some Militia. On this, Arnold escaped down the North River to New York, where he has impeached 30 of the Inhabitants, some of them people of Consequence. Washington has given André notice "to expect the worst", and Sr. H. Clinton has written to him (W) that if any Severity is used to Col. André, he will hang every one of those Traitors whom Arnold's Information has put in his Power.²⁶ An Embarkation lies at N. York supposed for the assistance of Ld. Cornwallis under the Command of Genl. Leslie.—We are perfectly quiet here, and the din of War is at a great Distance. This Country is very ill calculated for it, unhealthy, intersected with Creeks and Swamps, without good Water, and a most changeable Climate. The sickly Season is now over, tho' nobody begins to get well till the Frosts, which we wait for with the same Impatience, and will receive with the same Joy, the Egyptians do the rising of the Nile. . . .

CHARLESTOWN, Oct. 16th 1780. . . To what I wrote yesterday, I must add the arrival of a Fleet of 94 sail from Cork and London. . . Their appearance somewhat alarmed us, at least made us alive, and tho' we are but a small Garrison, shall not think meanly of ourselves while Moncrieff is amongst us . . . part of the Cork Fleet goes to New York. . . I have enquired for Shrubs and Seeds in which this Country abounded. The Approaches before the Town were carried on the Ground from whence their Collections were made. All the Houses were burnt and the Gardens etc trampled by 10,000 Men,—a vast enemy to Neatness or Curiosities.

CHARLESTOWN, Nov. 22nd, 1780. . . The *Blonde* arrived here on the 18th from New York and the Chesapeak. Genl. Leslie is landed in Virginia at Hampton with abo't 2,500 Men, and has found no Oposition. Lord Cornwallis is advancing on this Intelligence, who before was retiring towards Campden.

The *Blonde* confirms the execution of the unfortunate André, a Loss to the World in general, but so particularly to his Friends, that it is happy for those who did not know him. The whole Army went into Mourning for him, and felt as much as if he had been the Brother of each.

We are quite a Garrison of Foreigners, no British Regt. There are however many agreeable civiliz'd people, either left behind their Regt. sick, or prisoners. The Hessians do not mix at all. . . It is very probable I may remain some Years in this Country, a Garrison must always be kept up here during the War which is by no means at an End. The Climate is now delightful, rather hot in the Middle of the day, but not oppressive. I wd. give up every thing for a Month with you in Eng'd.

CHARLESTOWN, January 16th 1781. . . I did not doubt but that the Victory at Campden would be very agreeable Intelligence to you. It has a great deal of the miraculous in it, and cannot be supposed to happen again. If however it is fated that such an Occurrence sh'd happen, there is no Man more likely or deserving than Ld. Cornwallis. His Army is a family, he is the father of it. There are no Parties, no Competitions.

²⁶ Arnold used threats of retaliation; letter in Sparks's *Washington*, VII. 540. Clinton's letter (never sent), in Sargent's *André*, p. 385, cannot properly be said to do so.

What may not be expected from a force so united, a Leader so popular and patriotic? The word Patriot has become odious, but was an excellent good Word before it was ill-sorted. . . .

The Army is moved from Wynborough and may march without general Opposition which way they please. They will find many Friends while they are present—but the Country must be re-peopled with very different Inhabitants before they are to be calld good Subjects. The People in this Province came but slowly into rebellion, but at length it was general, and supported by more Principle than in most other Provinces. Every Man in the back Country is independent of his Neighbour. They had no Want but Cloaths; in which they were easily pleased—Skins and coarse Woolien Cloth is sufficient. . . .

I am glad to hear that [my sister] is different from most of the young Ladies of the Age. The specimen exhibited here is not to be wish'd or imitated. To judge of the People of this Country from what we now see, would certainly be highly unjust. All the People of Fashion in it are on the other Side of the Question. Most of the Young People of this Description were educated in England, sent there very young, and by remaining in it, till they were grown up, had the advantage of a good Education and Constitution. The rest are very deficient in both. . . .

NEW YORK, March 17th, 1781. I left Charlestown suddenly, so much so that I c'd not spare a few Minutes to write you by the *Galatca*. If I had wrote I could only have told you of a French Fleet on the Coast,²⁷ and raised your Anxiety for my Safety. We escaped them narrowly having passed them in the Night of the 9th Inst. We arrived on the 10th after a Passage of a Fortnight. . . . The *Romulus* saild some days before us and is said to be taken in the Chesapeake by the French;²⁸ I calld on Capt. Gayton to ask a Passage, he was not at Home, and I escaped being a Prisoner. These Ships are Part of Ternay's Squadron in Rhode Island, they have now left it, and dismantled the Works, consequently do not mean to return. Arbuthnot is in Pursuit of them with equal Force and must have met them before this as the Winds would not suffer them to get into the Chesapeak.²⁹—Arnold is in a critical Situation if the French can land, and must defend himself, knowing the consequence of being taken. Gen. Philips with the Lt. Infantry of the Army, 76th Regt. and some Hessians, are on board, if not saild to reinforce him. Lord Cornwallis has crossed the Roanoake and is also in Virginia, an astonishing March from Chas. Town. But it is not all gain that gets into the Purse; he leaves behind him a Country inimical to a Man, who would take any opportunity of distressing us in their Power. People from this Country, on going Home, pay their Court to the Minister by saying that the Government has many friends in it. It may have some, and those they speak of are only professed ones, real ones are very uncommon. . . . Among the many Examples of American Perfidy and the little Dependence to be placed on their Words, or Actions (for they have

²⁷ Only a 64 and two frigates, detached to the Chesapeak from the squadron at Newport by Commodore des Touches, who had succeeded to the command on Ternay's death.

²⁸ Captured Feb. 19, off the Capes.

²⁹ The engagement between Arbuthnot and des Touches had already occurred the day before (Mar. 16). The French prevailed, but the English retained the control of the Chesapeake.

always an interested View), take the Following, as it is consistent with my Knowledge, from friends of Veracity who were the Parties concern'd. After the Sixteenth of August, 250 Prisoners were conducting to Cha. Town by a Party of 30 Men. They were surrounded by Marian the Rebell Partizan and set at Liberty.³⁰ Our Officers were put on their Paroles and came to town. Abo't 90 of the Prisoners they were guarding, said they did not chuse to return to the Am'n Army, as they were better used and fed as Prisoners, and wd. follow them to Town.³¹ They did, and Ld. Cornwallis orderd each Man a Guinea Provisions, and those who chose it might enter into any of our Provincial Regts. A Company of the Infantry of the Legion were composed of them, and as it was tho't they would never dare to fall into the Hands of the Enemy, were look'd on as one of the best. In Col. Tarltons unfortunate Affair (of 18th Jany),³² in the beginning of the Action they went over to the Rebels, had their arms allowed them, and after the Action assisted in convoying the 7th Regt. who were taken Prisoners. You will hear but little of this 18th Jany, but be assured the Courage and Activity of Tarlton and a few of his officers was never more approv'd. . .

March 20th 1781, NEW YORK. I wrote you before by this Packet, and without any other Matter of a Public Nature than an Engagement between Adm'l Arbuthnot, and the French Fleet off the Capes of Virg'a. . . Their Object is frustrated, and ours will, I hope, be accomplished. . .

[On the subject of the chances of prosperous trading conditions, the writer says:] No Fortunes even in the best Times were ever made by the Commerce of America, unless by Smugling, or Planting, tho' ev'ry Individual lived in the greatest Affluence. The Merchant was ever an inferior Character to the Southward of N. York; there and to the N. Wd. he was as most Smugglers are.

None except a great and extensive Line of Business could ever interest me in the pursuit of it, and America is the only place such a thing can be attempted with a small capital. This is a great Encouragement, but its disadvantages are equal; the Number of Adventurers (for Adventurers alone will engage in it) make the Danger of Trusting great, the Confidence of the English Merch't less than what formerly existed, and from which so many at present suffer. The most profitable Trade will be the Exports from the Carolinas, Deer Skins, Pitch, Tar, Turpentine, Rice, Indigo and Tobacco. Pitch and Tar especially. . . The sense I use the Word Merch't in, is an Exporter or Importer to a Country without any internal Interest in it. . .

NEW YORK, 25th April, 1781. . . I wrote you immediately after my Arrival here. Since that time we have had nothing from Ld. Cornwallis till Yesterday. He has had an Action with Green in which he oppos'd 1,500 Men to 7,000 at Guildford Court House in N. Carolina.³³ The Rebels were defeated as usual with the Loss of their Cannon and Baggage. A Letter I have seen from the Army after relating this, says "I

³⁰ Weems (Horry) tells the story thus far, *Life of Marion* (Baltimore, 1814), p. 121; and Marion related it, thus far, to Horry in a letter of Aug. 27, 1780, Gibbes, *Documentary History, 1781-1782*, p. 11.

³¹ So also Moultrie, *Memoirs*, II. 224, and Hugh Gaine's *New York Mercury*, Sept. 25.

³² Cowpens

³³ Mar. 15

am notwithstanding very far from thinking our Warfare at an End; our March thro' this Country may be compared to the passage of a Ship thro' the Waves which give way on the least impulse, but immediately close when the Body has passed." Our Loss, I fear, is such as not to admit of such another Victory. Among the kill'd are Col. Stewart of the Guards, and Col. Webster of the 33rd, and some few more Officers of Distinction. Tarleton has lost half his right hand, and I hope not otherwise wounded. He is singularly fortunate as he may be said to have been seeking reputation in the *Cannons Mouth* for upwards of a Year, and till now unhurt.—Transports are preparing for an Embarkation, among which will be Cavalry, so apprehend they will go Southwd.³⁴ We are very quiet here and have as little the appearance of War as any Town in England. The only Appearance of Hostility is sometimes a plundering party on Long Island which levies Purveyance on all sides indiscriminately. These must continue for a long time after the War is put an End to, both in America and England. The Swarms of Vagabonds in both Countries, used rather to the Destroying than protecting the Rights of Society, will ill brook so much restraint as is necessary to the Security of Individuals, and Happiness of the Community. We see America in a very unfavorable Dress, who have not known her *in good Times*. . . To an Englishman the two first and most valuable Qualities a Country can have, are wanting, viz: Peace and Plenty. Tho' these may be regain'd, apparently there are some who can never forget their Exaltation thro' Sedition, others their Destruction by it; some have lost Sons, Husbands, Brothers, grasping at imaginary Liberty, thro' rebellion; other have lost their friends on Acc't of their virtuous and laudable Allegiance to their King and Country. These cannot love one another. The Inveteracy subsisting between the Natives of America of different Parties, is a second Part of the Contention between the Houses of York and Lancaster in England. . . A few days ago was bro't in here, Prie to the *Roebuck*, the Continental Frigate *Confederacy* of 36 Guns.³⁵ She is tho't to be superior to anything in the British Navy. Her Keel was laid for a 64 Gun ship. She is within 10 feet as long as the *Royal Oak*, and fights 14 Ports on a Side on one Deck. She is Loaded with Sugar and worth upwards of £50,000 Stlg. She struck without firing a Gun. . . I have just heard the french Fleet is at Sea. Ours is not yet ready. . .

NEW YORK, [undated] . . . The great Advantages of Trade, so often talked of "when this Country comes to be settled", as is the Phrase here, I most willingly subscribe to; this period I do not expect to see, tho' it is by no Means unlikely that a Cessation of Hostility in America may not be distant. The Inveteracy of Party will subsist, and the Pride of America will never submit to any other terms than Independance. We expect Peace in Europe, and shall then have nothing to quarrel with but America. . .

NEW YORK, June 8th 81. . . I have transcribed the enclosed Account of the transactions between Arnold and André from Hamilton's Letter to a friend in Philadelphia.³⁶ It is the most authentic and fullest Account of

³⁴ Reinforcements to Major-Gen. William Phillips in Virginia. *Cornwallis Corr.*, I. 95.

³⁵ The *Confederacy*, 32, was captured on Apr. 14, 1781, by the *Roebuck*, 44, and the *Orpheus*, 32. The *Royal Oak*, 74, was Admiral Arbuthnot's flag-ship.

³⁶ Hamilton to John Laurens, October, 1780. *Writings*, ed. Lodge, VIII, 18-29. A copy is enclosed in the letter.

the minute tho' effectual Steps which immediately follow'd Arnolds leaving his House. He had a boat in waiting to which he rode with some Precipitation, and, alighting from his Horse, tied him to a rail and, putting his Saddle into the Boat, desired to be row'd on board the *Vulture*. He could not conceal a kind of agitation on seeing the Guns moved along the Shore, and observed that the rain which lately fell might make it necessary to scale them, saying he hoped if they fire them this Way they have drawn the Shot. Thinking the artillery Officer w'd endeavor to bring the boat too. He arriv'd on board the *Vulture* safe, and being asked why he bro't his Saddle, said, to prevent the Suspicion which would have followed his taking out his Pistols, which having, he resolved not to have been taken. I think it probable that he would have turned them ag'st himself, as six men c'd have conveyed him on Shore after he had discharged them. . . .

We are upon no terms with the Clinton, but have every assistance from the C—s Party. . . . I have the strongest Reasons for thinking that the greatest part of the Army will be there [Carolina]. . . Part of the French troops from Rhode Island are within 16 Miles of Kingsbridge. As it is impossible that they can attack us, I imagine we shall attack them. Our Fleet is at Sea. A french Line of Battle Ship³⁷ and two Frigates are lately got into Rhode Island, having seen their Convoy of Transports and Store Ships safe into Boston. We anxiously wait for the *Warwick* and her Reinforcement, which will enable us to make Lord C. very easy.³⁸ In his Letters to the Com'r in Chief from Virginia he says, "I think it would be dishonorable to go to C. Town by Sea, but I tremble for the Carolinas." This is not known to many People, yet is to be depended on. The french troops are going to take possession of West Point (etc) and Washington to the Southw'd.

The fleet sails next Week for England, by which as usual I shall write; my Uncle hints at a total failure of Public Credit. I hope that is far distant. I look upon the Debt of the Nation as an Argument of the Riches of Individuals, and cannot think that the failure of P. Credit would be half so detrimental to England, as if half the Artificers in England were to become Bankrupts. They would then flock to this Country and in Spite of [?Fate] render her independent of all the World. If the Rebells succeed in their Attempt of shaking us off, the Congress have promised to reward Washington with Staten Island.³⁹ It is abo't the size of the I. of Wight.

NEW YORK, June 11th, 81. . . Genl. Arnold and the transports from Virginia arrived here on the 9th (without the Troops.) He is universally disliked, and will probably never get another Command. . . When this fleet left Virginia, the *Richmond* was just arriv'd from Cha. Town. She bro't intelligence that Lord Rawdon had abandoned Campden, and was at Monks Corner 24 Miles from C. Town. I have not heard anything of Green. Ld. C. was just going to march ag'st Fayette who was abo't 12 Miles distant, near Portsm'th in Virginia. The Marquis said he would not retreat, but wait the Event of a Battle. Nothing but abso-

³⁷ The *Concorde* arrived in Newport harbor May 8. Vicomte de Noailles, *Mémoires et Soldats Français en Amérique*, p. 217.

³⁸ The *Warwick* arrived ("sickly") before July 2. Graves to Rodney, in Beatson, *Naval and Military Memoirs*, V. 257.

³⁹ Unfounded rumor, it must be supposed.

lute Necessity can justify taking the field at this Season of the Y^r in Carolina; something however must be done for Ld Rawdon. . . . The Seat of War henceforward will be to the Southward as this place cannot be attempted without any considerable Sea Force. How this Matter will end, no Conjectures worth attending to can be formed. One thing I am clear of, that this Country, so far from ever being what it was, will not after the War be so good as it is now. So much the greater Part of the Inhabitants are agst us, that those who remain here must conform to their Tenets, or lead a very unpleasant Life. People say, when we have conquered them we may make what Laws we please: but do they think the Inhabitants, convinced of our Supremacy only by force, will obey them any longer than the force exists? I think not. All our Schemes for subduing them may have great Merit, yet I sh^d think more Praise due to the Projector of a system of Trade without them. I have no Doubt that Europe would have done very well had America never been discovered—Great Britain, I dare say, much better.

NEW YORK, July 2, 1781. . . . I hope by that Time [next Winter] that Peace may be established in Europe. I'm sorry to say there's no Prospect of it in this Country. . . . I dont know how to give you the present State of Polities. Ld. Rawdon had marched out of C. Town with all the old Garrison and the flank Companies of the newly arrived Regts., to support Col. Cruger at Ninety Six, near 200 Miles from thence. The new Regts. were left at and near C. Town. Ld. Cornwallis had not returned from his Pursuit of Fayette, whom he had pursued (and probably dispersed) in the Mountains. He had been gone from Richmond 3 Weeks, with nearly his whole Army mounted. Here we are doing nothing. The Grenadiers are on the other side the E. River on the Heights of Brooklyn throwing up Works, like Labourers, for the Benefit of the Chief Engineer, which goes very much against the grain of their Wishes. Part of the French troops from Rhode Island have joined Washington at West Point: they say they intend to take New York. The G—I is as mad as the Devil on Account of the Whole reinforcement under Convoy of the *Warwick* being detained in Carolina. The Adm'l goes Home and is succeeded by Graves. The French fleet is at Rhode Island. Our affairs thro' the Continent do not seem in a flourishing Condition, but whether greater Exertions might not have been attended wth greater Disadvantage, is a Question about wh. the learned disagree. Those who say No, affirm that the best thing that cld have happened to us would have been the total Destruction of N. York, which the Rebels themselves attempted on Evacuation of it. I am of that Opinion, as Experience has proved that a residence in it has affected all our Leaders with a Numbness very unfit for the active scenes they were sent here to fill. By this fleet (as by every other from England) we find you are resolved to finish the American War out of Hand, while we, despairing of any such Event, turn our Eyes to Europe for Peace. Let us not both be disappointed. . . . Washington, I have just been informed, is at the White Plains, a short days March from Kings Bridge, invited there by our lethargic Proceedings. Ld. C—s Character for Activity and Vigilance keeps his Enemies at a more respectable Distance. . . . This Conveyance is the *Rocbuck* with Adm'l Arbuthnot, who is order'd Home.⁴⁰ I fear he is more unpopular than he deserves to be, which to you will be no Matter of Admiratio

⁴⁰ Rear-Adm. Thomas Graves took over his command July 4.

know how easily the Multitude is misled. He may have some faults in his Disputes with the G—I, and those are on both Sides. I believe they did not begin with him. He is very old and somewhat Prejudiced, certainly unfit for a Command which requires so much Activity, [and] Clearness of Enterprize. He was wrong when he sufferd Sr. Andrew Hammond to go Home.⁴¹ If we c'l'd dispose of Sr. H. everything would assume a diff't appearance and to that evry Soul in the Army looks, except his own A. D. Cs.

NEW YORK, July 26, 1781. . . Ld. Cornwallis has had an Action with part of Fayettes Army in Virginia, in which Victory declared for him as usual.⁴² The Enemy lost abo't 300 Men, and would have suffered much more had the Cavalry been order'd to charge, which Night prevented. . . The Duc de Lausun has sent invitations to several Officers he was acquainted with in France, which have not been accepted. This seems to show that he is not ashamed of his Ragamuffins. Most of the Continentals are dressed in Scarlet—their Number are said to be abt 12,000. They have been within our reach for about 3 Weeks, as yet unmolested. The Success of this Campain will be with that Party who have the first Naval reinforcement. Happily for us the French and Spanish hate one another. If the latter had come here instead of attacking Pensacola, the Place would stand a bad chance. They had 15 Sail of the Line and 11,000 Land Forces. The Rebels say they wish Lord C. was Commander in Chief, that then he w'd be as inactive as they could wish. They might be deceived. . .

[July 26.] To give you a short State of Affairs in this Country. Washington and the french troops had mustered to the Am't of 12,000 Men on the White Plains, with a view to make us withdraw Part of our Force from the Southward, succeeded so far, but, an intercepted Letter giving information of that being their only Intention, the Com'r in Chief sent an Express to Ld. Cornwallis to say he did not wish to interfere with his views, or that he sh'd abandon any acquisition, but if any troops could be spared during the summer they sh'd be returned as soon as the Climate w'd permit them to act.⁴³ On the 22 and 23rd, they appeard before Kingsbridge in considerable Force, and it was supposed they had their whole Force at no great Distance ready to support them if attacked.

The Com'r in C. went out to see them, which was not unnoticed on their Parts. They gave him several Cannon Shot, some of them very near. They could not have pleased him more. They are returnd to the White Plains. If they sh'd fail in drawing off our Force they will at least preserve their Crops which at this Time of the Year we usually went out to seize. This Manoeuvre goes under the decent appellation of Foraging. . .

The fleet with our new Admiral (Graves) is at Sea. We do not know his Object. In England y'r Newspapers tell all they know, and more—this is not the Case here. They are forbid to publish any thing without leave, and endeavor to recommend themselves to the reigning Powers by

⁴¹ After the capture of Charleston, Arbuthnot had sent Sir Andrew Snape Hamond, one of his best captains, home with the despatches. He was now governor of Nova Scotia.

⁴² Engagement at Green Spring, July 6.

⁴³ The intercepted letter was of course intended to be intercepted, the plan for marching to Virginia having been already formed.

exaggerating every little Success and turning indifferent Circumstances to our Advantage. Military Government does not allow that Liberty to the Press that civil does.

N. Y., Aug. 15th, 81.⁴⁴ . . . The fleet goes out in two days—25 Sail of the Line perfectly manned and appointed. . . I am going to Charlestown and sail with the Fleet. . . Great Exertions, seconded by great good Luck, may restore us; and as every Body is sensible of the Consequences of a Failure, I have no Doubt will act accordingly. I hope the next opportunity will enable me to tell you that we shall be able to hold up our Head among the Nations. . .

NEW YORK, August 10th, 1781. . . Within these few days our Cruisers have been very successfull, having bro't in the *Trumbull* of 32 Guns, the *Bellisarius* and *Resolution* of 24 each.⁴⁵ The two former have been very troublesome in their day. By the latest English Papers I see you begin to handle our Chief roughly. He is naturally active and enterprizing, but has not a Strength and Soundness of Capacity sufficient to distinguish and decide in great Objects, and like the hungry Ass between two Bundles of hay, for want of preference, starves. Add to this, he is totally unassisted, having no Man of the smallest Military Character about him. With as much pride as any Human being ever possessed, he wants that Dignity of Character which should supply food for it; And as it is a Passion that must be fed, preys on the garbage of gross Flattery, to the exclusion of every Man whose candor and decency precludes the use of it.

NEW YORK, Sept. 26, 1781. I think 12 or 18 Months will bring us all Home. . . Affairs in this Country stand thus. Lord Cornwallis at York in Virginia, with an Enemy not less than 6 times his Numbers before him. The Chesapeak entirely in the possession of the French who have 32 sail of the Line in it. Our Fleet are now refitting after an Action with part of the French,⁴⁶ and will, I suppose, go out again as soon as possible. We have everything to hope from the Hardiness of Ld. C. and his Troops if the French attack him. If they do not, he must be starved as he cannot attack them, and then—farewell America!

We have for some Time past had between 5 and 7000 men embark'd intended for his assistance, but they cannot be sent, the French having Possession of the only Avenue. For my own Part I have no Hopes of their storming him. The French Engineer who directed the Operations of the immense Force under Galvez after the taking of Pensacola, was asked, Why they did not storm during nine weeks; He s'd it was tried at Savannah, with't Success.

I wish Moncrief⁴⁷ was with Ld. C. because I'm sure he wishes it himself. He lives only in Danger, and delights in Difficulty. When the

⁴⁴ The date appears to be wrong, for on Aug. 15, 1781, Graves's fleet had not returned from its ill-timed cruise to the eastward, and he had only five ships of the line capable of sailing, until reinforced by Hood's fourteen on Aug. 28. *Graves Papers* (ed. Chadwick, Naval Hist. Soc.), pp. lxi, lxvii, 21, 52; *Letters of Sir Samuel Hood* (Navy Records Soc.), pp. xxxvi, 26; Beatson, VI. 283.

⁴⁵ The *Trumbull*, U. S. frigate, built at Middletown, Connecticut, taken Aug. 9. For the privateer *Bellisarius*, see N. Y. Biog. and Gen. Record, LIII. 349.

⁴⁶ Action of Sept. 5.

⁴⁷ Lieut.-Col. James Moncrieff, who had been chief engineer in the siege of Charleston.

superiority of Force and Cannon was pointed out to him at Savannah, he said. When we find their Cannon too heavy for us, we must draw in our's and fill up our Embrasures, and trust to our Bayonets; and then, the strongest Nerves will carry it, "and", says he, "by G— we have stronger Nerves than these French and Yankees."—

Our fleet is now abt 23 sail of the Line—the Enemy's 32 including 2 of 50; they have one 3 Decker, we 3. We know we are well manned, and sh'd not despair or let the greatness of the Object we are going to contend for to inspire any other Sensation than Resolution and Confidence. We are going to fight for America, I may almost say for our existence as a Kingdom, and I think, when the day comes, if every Officer in the fleet would animate his Crew by these Considerations, and an Example expressing a Conviction of their force, we may expect a day that would not disgrace our brightest Annals.

I shall probably see this Struggle and, if so, you shall see an Account of it. I only fear we may not have it in our Power to make our appearance at Sea, till Ld. C. is swallowed up, and then it little signifies whether we beat or are beat. So much for dismal Politicks. . . Direct to me at Charlestown by the next Conveyance there.

Sept. 27th 81. . . Of the late naval Engagement I shall say nothing, Graves having sent the *Medea* Home with an Acc't of it immediately after; and of our political Situation, the less is said the better; it is a melancholy one. Ld. C. is at York in Virginia, I fear very short of provisions, with the whole Force of France and America by Sea and Land against him. The Land Forces cannot be ascertained as the Militia of the Country collect from all Quarters. The Force by Sea, 32 Ships of the Line, are placed in the Chesapeak—the only Avenue. We have had between 5 and 7000 of our best Troops embarked for his Assistance, but the impossibility of their getting there has appeared strongly enough to cause them to be relanded. Three days after I last wrote you, I had an Offer of a Passage to C. Town. I accepted it, but the appearance of such an Host of enemy's has prevented our sailing. I imagine the fleet will be ready in abt 10 days, when we shall all go to Sea together. You may expect an Account of the next Engagement as I shall probably see it, and you will be more likely to understand it than if it was written by a Seaman. If I was in England, and in a Situation to be affected by the Fate of Ld. C., I sh'd act as if he was captured. You may assure yourself they will not attack him, and his numbers are such as will prevent his assaulting them. The Prince⁴⁸ has arrived at an unfortunate Time, things look worse than they have ever done. . . All our Efforts are now exerted upon the Fleet. I imagine my next will be from Charlestown.⁴⁹

CHARLESTOWN, Dec. 24th, 1781. . . I before told you I left N. York on the 19th Oct., however I mean to recapitulate. Our Fleet consisted of 27 sail of the Line, Frigates, Fireships, etc, etc. On the 24th we ar-

⁴⁸ William Henry, duke of Clarence, afterward King William IV. He was at this time a midshipman on the *Prince George*, Admiral Digby, which had arrived at New York on Sept. 21. The prince was at New York most of the time for a year. *Letters of Sir T. Byam Martin*, I. 13; *Graves Papers*, p. 97; Allardice, *Memoir of Viscount Keith*, p. 56. *Writings of Washington*, ed. Ford, IX. 466-467, on plot for capturing him.

⁴⁹ At this point several letters are missing.

rived off the Chesapeak, the Place of our Destination, and expected hourly to go in, till the 28th, when we were informed we had no Friends to relieve there. Ld. C., as you will find by a thorough Investigation which must take Place in England, persevered in the Defence of the Place till the 29th, and then made an Attempt to cross to Gloucester, and endeavor to make his Way to N. York. He failed and was forced to capitulate.

The Circumstances which led to this most severe Stroke were primarily a Want of Intelligence at Home of a Superior French Force (Naval) arriving on this Coast. There is also said to have been a Want of Exertion and Conduct in the Action of the 19th Sept. off the Chesapeake. After that day our Fleet returned to N. York, and ten days or a Fortnight was thought the longest Time they could take to prepare for Sea. This induced the C. in Chief to inform Ld. C. that the relief would sail abt' the 5th Oct. and induced his Lordship to attempt the Defense of those Posts till it could arrive, rather than accept the Alternatives of fighting so unequal an Enemy, or harrassing his Troops by a very laborious March thro' the Country, by crossing to Glo[uceste]r.

The Fleet were delayed till the 10th, the day his Lordship fell. So far the Comr. in C. appears blameless, and with this View of the Matter, the Navy alone seem culpable. But we must go back to August when Washington and Rochambeau crossed the N. River with 6,000 [?], Cannon, Baggage, etc. which all Military People think might have been prevented. Had it so happened, Ld. C. would never have hesitated to give the rest battle and would in all Probability have defeated them.

The Effects of this unfortunate Affair appear in this Country by a large Army mustered under Greene and Wayne whose present Stations I am not acquainted with. They were about Santee. Our Army is 6 Miles from Town. This Place stands on a Neck of Land which at that Distance is scarcely a Mile broad. We are making it as strong as possible by 3 Redoubts at almost equal Distances across it. When they are compleatly finished, I imagine the Army will move out. They are commanded by Genl. Leslie who is very much beloved and in whom the troops have a great confidence. A fleet from England arrived here on the 21 under Convoy of the *Rotterdam* and *Astrea*. . . .

I beg you will be particular in describing the Effects of Ld. C's Misfortune in England. I expect it will have very violent ones. Whether a change of Ministers will take place I am at a Loss to judge. The present I look upon as very profligate ones, as I believe they would sacrifice the best Officers to suit their purposses, rather than give up the worst with any Disadvantage to themselves. If the present are continued Lord C. will have a very difficult part to act. His Rank will prevent his being exchanged, and I believe, if exchanged, his Inclination would not lead him to act again in this Country, even if Comr. in Chief. As he cannot be of use they will not defend him. If they do, they must give up Sr. H. C. . . .

All that can be expected of us is to make a good [?] Tugg. We have Hopes of a reinforcement of Troops and Ships from N. York. . . Eight or ten days will now determine whether they are well grounded. . .

I have never heard what became of the French Troops which were in Virginia. Whether they went in the Fleet to the W. Ind's or remained.

Washington behaved with amazing Hautiness to Ld. C., and a Mr Laurens, son to the Gentleman in the Tower, proposed his being detained as a Hostage for his Father. . .⁵⁰

CHARLESTOWN, Jan. 23, 82. . . The reinforcement expected from N. York dwindled into a few Recruits, arrived under Convoy of the *Charlestown*. Our Army is still at the Quarter House, 6 miles from Town and from their Number incapable of proceeding further. . .

Nothing is going forward at N. York in the Military way, yet they wont give us any troops. They might be employed in 6 Hours here. . .

CHARLESTOWN, March 3, 1782. . . I think your farm improves by your Account. I could not help writing the Words I have drawn a line under, as they are auxiliaries in all Conversations here, from their appearance in Sr. H. C's thanks to Genl. Stewart's Army after the Battle of the Ewtaws,⁵¹ viz: "And I beg you will present my thanks to the Officers and Soldiers under your Comd., for their very spirited Exertions in a Conflict, which appears so very unequal, by your Account." He is willing Genl. S. should be thanked, so makes him thank himself. . .

12th. We go on very indifferently in the W. Inds.; perhaps things may mend since our Reinforcement is arrived. I should not be surprised at losing them all except Jamaica.

It is now allowed on all Hands that military Operations in this extensive Country are above the compass of our Force, and it is recommended that we continue the War by Sea, keeping our Garrisons and the footing we at present possess. Our present Situation is then in reality what is proposed. We have three posts on the Continent, all very exceptionable in regard to the first Object—a good Harbour; and from these Posts we frequently send small parties ag'st Detachments of the Enemy to make us hated and execrated more than feared or respected. In short the War has driven both Parties to that State of Animosity that they fight whenever they meet with't prospect of Advantage, like two Species of Animals whose Nature it is to work the Destruction of each other. The Expense of Garrisons is enormous, the use, in my Opinion, none.

But as I blame what has been attempted and what is proposed, I am called upon to say what I wish to be adopted. Repossession of Rhode Island as our sole Post, to evacuate Augustine, Savannah, Charlestown and New York; Halifax and Newfoundland are not contended for. From thence I would harrass their trade, and take possession of everything that appeared upon the Water. Before this could be done there must be peace in Europe, which ought to be made on any terms. . . What remained of our troops I would then transport to the E. Inds. as I imagine they would rather be troublesome than otherwise in England. . .

I have been reading Sallust lately, and was often surprized at his direct representation of the present Times. We have in Eng'd the followers of Catalina, impoverished by dissipation, in America the Numidians, "Genus Hominum mobile, infidum, novarum rerum cupidum" . . One of his Characters seems to suit Lord C. . .

We have but few Officers who are really anxious for the Service, the generallity call it a *Bore*, a word unknown, I believe, in the Am'n Army.⁵²

⁵⁰ Cornwallis and Henry Laurens were exchanged early in 1782. Three letters are missing before the next date.

⁵¹ Sept. 8, 1781.

⁵² The word was recent in England. The Oxford Dictionary gives no example earlier than 1766.

The Address, remonstrance, and Petition of the City of London to the King⁵³ is wonderfully strong. It is possible that it might proceed from Men more warm than wise, with an honest intention. If so, we may at least call it extremely illjudged.

[Undated; CHARLESTOWN, July 10, 1782.?]. . . . It is now July, and we have nothing to expect but an almost intollerable degree of Heat for two months to come. . . . When I wrote you last by Way of New York I thought peace would take place to a Certainty within 6 months. I had fixed on the people to be concerned with, one of whom would remain here by choice, another must have been placed at Savannah, and I had it at my Option to live at Home, or at either. The fourth of the Party would have been with me at any Event—In Speculation, but of that, one fact can overturn a Mountain—he was a Week after taken prisoner, and is now in the Hands of the Enemy. The fashion of the War at present is retaliation, and he is detained till we release a rebel Judge. This I hope will be complied with, however it is not a hanging Matter. . . . If you expect Intelligence from me of the War, I fear you will be disappointed. There is no War.

Sir G. C.⁵⁴ desires the Congress to give his Secretary leave to come and treat with them, and sends a few old newspapers and Magazines to shew them that the people at Home are clamorous and unruly, and that it will be almost impossible to quiet them by any other means, than Peace with America. The Congress, knowing the State of the Kingdom full as well as his Excellency, (which were it not the Case they would never submit to learn from such despicable documents,) return in Answer a firm Determination not to enter into any treaty with him—encouraged to risk all the Events of War, probably, by his parental Declaration of the mild manner in which he means to conduct it.

Would a Master tell a parcel of Boys that if they stole his apples he would whip them—in the gentlest Way imaginable, what would they think of him—what do *they* think of Sr. G. C'n? Surely he might speak daggers tho' he uses none. The American Writers now hold out to the people that the English House of Lords and Commons have no more a power of making them independent than they have of directing the Councils of England. That they should never expect a recognition of their Independence, and that the French King might as well be uneasy because George 3d calls himself K. of France.

A Vessel from the W. Indies says that the French Fleet having had no reinforcement, a decided Superiority is ours. The worst is, that in order to put ourselves in the way of Fortune, we must keep at Sea, which in these months may be attended with very bad Consequences. Hurricanes may be expected after the 27 June—from that time double Insurance commences.

What will his Country do for Rodney?⁵⁵ A peer—Knight of the Garter, etc, I suppose. He should not trust her again but testify his Gratitude by a Temple, *Fortunae felici!* . . .

The person I mentioned in a former part of this Letter is since come in on Parole. There are rewards and punishments in this Life. As he

⁵³ Of Dec. 6, 1781.

⁵⁴ Guy Carleton, letter of May 7. See *Journals of Continental Congress*, XXII, 263, and Gordon, IV, 291.

⁵⁵ For his great naval victory of Apr. 12.

had before had it in his power to do Acts of Humanity to many of the Americans, on his being taken, General Green wrote to every family near Georgetown, to which port he was carried, to show him every Civility. The whole Country made it an Object to distinguish themselves by Acts of Kindness. . . .

When you next write to me I beseech you conjecture roundly of the fate of this Country. What Effect the Victory in the W. Indies will have, What are the Sentiments of the People when they find that the Americans will have nothing to do with them, and seem determined to give France the preference in all Matters of Commerce. . . . What would I not give for the knowledge of the Market Politics of England on this toth of July!

[I suppose you] acquainted with the Evacuation of Savannah⁵⁶—An Act possibly preparatory to the Evacuation of this Province. It is an Act which of all others hurts the Pride of Loyalists all over the Continent, whilst it absolutely ruins the Inhabitants affected to Government. They endeavored to make Terms, and Wayne said that their Persons and Properties sh'd be protected from the Army, but that the Law must have its Course.

CHARLESTOWN, Sept. 8th, 1782. Yesterday brought me your Letters of 22 March and 28th April. If I live so long as the first of those periods next Year I shall probably be with you in England. The Contractors Bill having passed will affect us very little;⁵⁷ the 12 months allowed them to settle will bring it to the End of this strange eventfull War. The Amount of the Blunders and Follies of which are as nothing to this strange way of ending it. . . .

I am so exceedingly interested about seeing my friends in England, that I am almost without hope of its ever happening. Without thinking of it, if it is to come to pass, the invisible sweeping foot of Time will accomplish it.

Desire Transport off Chas Town, Dec. 13th, 1782. . . . I have got all public matters off my Hands, and ship't [?] myself in order to write to my friends in quiet. The last Embarkation will take place to-morrow morn'g, after which, I suppose, no time will be lost to get out of an Enemy Country. . . . Almost the whole of the British troops are destined to the W. Indies—the Hessians and Provincials go to N. York, having stipulated to serve only in America. This looks very like totally relinquishing the Continent. If that was intended, some terms might have been made for those who have adhered to us. No pact though has been attempted and they are left entirely to the Mercy of the Enemy. . . . You have so many Changes in Administration at Home, that I should not be surprised at Lord North's again being at the Treasury. Mr Fox ought to be very low in the Opinions of every Body, nothing can be more profligate than his Conduct, but that the mob are no Judges of. You know best when to expect me in England. . . .

NEW YORK, Feby. 16th 1783. I wrote you by the Packet that sailed from hence last Month, since which nothing of Importance has reached us, except the King's Speech. It gives us the strongest Hopes of Peace, tho' it is greatly feared the terms will not be so advantageous as another successfull Campaign might authorize us to demand. It however favors the Object on which I am most bent, being among my friends in England.

⁵⁶ July 11.

⁵⁷ 22 Geo. III. c. 50.

I apprehend it will be very difficult to restrain the Emigrations of Mechanics from England to this Country on the Declaration of her Independence. No Encouragement will be wanting here to invite them to it. . . . As you have doubtless sent several Vessels from England in December, I think we cannot much longer remain uninformed of the terms of Peace—the Anxiety for authentic Accounts is excessive.⁵⁸

⁵⁸ The writer's longing to return home was fulfilled a few months after the date of the last letter, for in July, 1783, Thomas Harley wrote to his friend to tell him that his son Robert had arrived safely at his (Mr. Harley's) house in London. V. B.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

The New Larned History for Ready Reference, Reading, and Research: the Actual Words of the World's Best Historians, Biographers, and Specialists. . . . Based on the work of the late J. N. LARNED, now completely revised, enlarged, and brought up to date. In twelve volumes. Volume III. *Chopin to Eloc.*; Volume IV. *Eloc to Frob.* (Springfield, Mass.: C. A. Nichols Publishing Company. 1923. Pp. viii, 1735-2638; viii, 2639-3542.)

THE *Larned History for Ready Reference* appears more than ever as a cyclopaedia of history, government, geography, literature, and even of drama and education. The third and fourth volumes are on the same lines as the first, and much that was said in the review of the first volume can, therefore, be omitted here. These later volumes make a better impression upon the careful reader. One still notices that the print is not easy to read, that authorities readily accessible are preferred sometimes to better and quite obvious choices, and that some obsolete maps and some unsatisfactory illustrations are to be seen. Yet the choice of authorities is distinctly better. The articles Christianity, Constantinople, Czechoslovakia, Democracy, Denmark, Europe, England, and France all show this improvement, though one would criticize too much use, as on Czechoslovakia, of Canadian government pamphlets, and small-fry magazines in place of easily accessible public documents. Not all publications of Central European states are propaganda.

If one took from the fourth volume all the topics on England and English literature, France, French literature, and the Franks, one would reduce it to very modest proportions and this despite the inclusion of Europe in this same volume. "Feudalism" helps also to swell the amount of material relating to France. On Europe the list seems familiar: Breasted, Finlay, Mahaffy, Robinson, G. B. Adams, D. C. Munro, Guérard, Bourne, Fisher, Turner, Marriott, etc., etc. Wells appears. Nitti's long extract is rather partizan and ephemeral.

France and England are equally well served, the first by such as Wakeman, Kitchin, Bonnechose, Baird, and Macdonald, etc. (possibly Guizot and Martin are a little too prominent); the latter by Gardiner, Adams, Lecky, Porritt, Bright, McCarthy, Hobhouse, each suggesting some particular field of excellence. Later French history is well cared for by Sorel, Lowell, Aulard, Johnston, Morley, etc. On the Crusades we have Bréhier, Cox, Pears, Gibbon, Finley, and Michaud, all having

well-known excellencies. These references, given at some length, show that the editors have been happiest with the proved writers of history, least happy in picking their way among present-day special-plea publicists.

One is somewhat surprised to see the comparative brevity of the biographical articles, despite the reputation of biographies for being interesting. Several genealogical tables of novel design are inserted.

One deprecates the omission from "Constantinople" of the famous description of its fall, by Gibbon. The treatment of Czechoslovakia is somewhat imperfect, owing partly to the slighting of Czechoslovak writers. No source for its constitution is mentioned. For reference purposes Bohemia is separated from Czechoslovakia, for ready reading and appreciation it should not be. (Does it not seem rather awkward, too, for the "Franks" to come after the "French"?) The Danube (III. 2253) does not flow *through* Bulgaria, though it does through Jugoslavia (Serbia). It also flows through and beside Czechoslovakia. (It is hard to get the map of 1914 off our retinas.) It was not the invasion of Silesia exactly which "produced the Seven Years' War" (III. 2325).

The third volume is very rich in topics on government and allied subjects, the city manager, commission government, conservation, civic beauty, civil service reform, crime, copyright, law of all kinds and connections, commerce, debt, etc., though the treatment is historical as well as topical. Much space is given to the various states of the United States and Latin America, to the Congress of the United States, and to some large cities, Cleveland, Copenhagen, Dublin, etc. A list of the constitutions included is also given, and of many valuable treaties, laws, state papers, etc. (III. 2331-2338).

The text-cuts (black and white) continue to be blurred frequently, though well chosen; the colored "duotones" are excellent in clearness and unhackneyed in subject. Two colored maps show the development of Christianity; there is one of Constantinople and the Straits and two of the Mediterranean Lands and the Time of the Crusades with the Caliphate and Latin Europe inserts. Then in black and white follow: Czechoslovakia (III. 2228; no name assigned to Rusinia), Danish Territory Recovered from Germany, and Egypt in 1914. European, English, and French history each have a series of maps, nine in color and four in black and white, the colored maps best for clearness and usefulness. The latest, however, might have given us Czechoslovak, Rumanian, and Jugoslav names instead of the German or Magyar, especially as Poland is well favored in this respect. The language map (IV. 2950-2951), superimposed upon a bygone background, is hardly fair to the French, or to the Bulgars of Macedonia.

ARTHUR I. ANDREWS.

La Formation du Peuple Grec. Par A. JARDÉ, Professeur d'Histoire au Lycée Lakanal. [*L'Évolution de l'Humanité*, dirigée par Henri Berr, X.] (Paris: La Renaissance du Livre. 1923. Pp. xii, 425. 15 fr.)

This is the tenth of a series of one hundred volumes projected on the evolution of humanity. Twenty-six will be devoted to antiquity and six to Greece alone, as the country which has most influenced civilization. The first to be published on Greece considers in part I. the country: the land, waters, sea, and their exploitation. In part II. the Hellenes install themselves in the different regions of Greece and develop their separate personalities. The topics are the peoples, the races, the frontiers, central Greece, Peloponnesus, Sparta, Athens. Part III. is consecrated to the expansion of Hellenic civilization, the chapters entitled Colonization, the Greece of Asia, Expansion in the Eastern and Western Mediterranean. Part IV. discusses on the one hand the efforts toward unity by the similarity of civilization and by patriotism in the face of a common enemy (moral unity of language, religion, and customs), and on the other hand the particularistic spirit which finally overthrew Greek liberty and so weakened the Greek cities that they could not withstand the attack of Macedon. But this led to a new unified Hellenism, which was to be spread over the world, the subject of another volume. The book is a fascinating, interesting, and readable combination of history, archaeology, literature, and linguistics, based on erudition and sound learning, which however is not paraded. It is written somewhat on the plan of Zimmern's attractive *Greek Commonwealth* (which should be cited in the third edition), with more attention paid to geology, climate, the sciences, economics, and literary and philosophical culture than in other short Greek histories. Much use is made of epigraphy and of writers such as Strabo and Pausanias who are rarely recognized even by specialists in ancient history as good historians rather than as ancient Baedekers.

There is a good index and a useful bibliography in which, however, no attention is paid to important American literature. Doukas's exhaustive volume of a thousand pages on *Sparta*, published in modern Greek by the *Hellenic Herald* (New York, 1922), and Trever's *History of Greek Economic Thought* certainly should be mentioned; but even Glotz's *Le Travail dans la Grèce, Histoire Économique de la Grèce*, is forgotten. The novel method of referring in the text to books in the bibliography by Roman numerals is not altogether satisfactory.

There are few errors, but one dislikes to see the battle of Chaeronea dated 398 instead of 338 (p. 117), Pteria called Piera (p. 236), Mimmermus credited to Smyrna, not Colophon (p. 244), the western group on the map of alphabets indicated by a different shading from that in the key to the map (p. 285), Acarnania called Arcananie (p. 382), *rēscopos* for *éscopos* (p. 388), etc. On page 140 we read that Arcadia has no view of the sea, but I have often seen it from Mt. Lycaeus and other Arcadian heights.

In conclusion let me heartily recommend to all who are interested in the evolution of modern civilization this well-written, sane volume, scholarly but popular in a good sense, which stresses the fact that the Greeks were the forerunners of the moral, humanitarian, and social emphasis so conspicuous in present-day ideas of economy and history.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

Hellenen und Barbaren: Aus der Geschichte des Nationalbewusstseins. By JULIUS JUETHNER. (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1923. Pp. viii, 165.)

THIS subject has long interested students of ancient history, ever since the appearance of Steinhofer's *Dissertatio Critica de Voce βάρβαρος* (Tübingen, 1732). It has been treated in several recent dissertations, most completely in Eichhorn's *βάρβαρος quid significaverit* (Leipzig, 1904), and Mystakides's *Αἱ λέγεις Ἑλλῆν, Γραικός, Πουαῖος, Βογαντίος*, etc. (Tübingen, 1920).

The present study, forming volume VIII. of Otto Immisch's series *Das Erbe der Alten*, traces the ideas which correspond with the terms "Hellene" and "Barbarian" down through the centuries from Homer to about the twelfth century A.D. It is divided into nine chapters and contains 342 critical notes, a short bibliography, and an excellent index.

The subject is introduced by a discussion of the derivation of the word "barbaros". Against the Semitic origin recently urged by E. Weidner (*Glotta*, 1912-1913, pp. 303-304), Dr. Juethner follows most authorities in finding it good Indo-European with the basic meaning "stammering", "unintelligible in speech". Only after the Persian wars did the term take on its secondary meaning of inferiority and include all peoples behind the Greeks in liberty and culture. The word "Hellene", though appearing in Homer, was first used by Hesiod in a national sense. The two terms gradually became and remained sharply antithetical.

The Sophists first proclaimed human equality by nature and thus gave a rational basis to the concept "barbarian" (ch. II.). Plato (ch. III.) followed their lead only haltingly, for he regarded only such foreigners as lived among Greeks as non-barbarians. His national spirit, so evident in the Hellenic ideal at the base of the *Republic*, kept him from carrying the new idea to its logical consequences. Against the Sophist's idea that "free" and "slave" were merely the result of custom, Aristotle continued to defend the national prejudice that the difference was grounded in nature. Alexander (ch. IV.), with his idea of amalgamating Greeks and Orientals, here broke with his great teacher. But the ideal of the Sophists was first to be developed, though in a narrow Greek way, by Isocrates and the Atticists (ch. V.), who taught that "Hellene" was no longer a connotation of descent, but of culture. But a truer cosmopolitanism began with the idealism of foreigners which resulted from Alexander's attempt to Hellenize Asia (ch. VI.). While Plato and Aristotle had based their political ideal in the old Greek *Polis*, the followers of the

Sophists—Cyrenaics, Sceptics, Cynics—proclaimed a World State. The Stoics promulgated the idea, though their state was still the Greek world (*Oikoumene*), which since Alexander's day reached only as far as the Greek language. Their cosmopolitanism, however, was no longer restricted to cultured Greeks, but extended to all men cultivated in the Greek fashion.

In chapter VII, the author traces the status of the Romans in the old formula "Hellenes" and "Barbarians", and similarly that of the Christians in chapter VIII. The most interesting chapter is the last, the Byzantine Age, in which the later history of the concepts "Hellene" and "Barbarian", along with such other terms as "Helladikoi", "Italikoi", "Graikoi", "Latinoi", and especially the complete change wrought in the meaning of "Romans" to signify Greeks, are discussed. "Roman", earlier a political term limited to the Latin West, and under the emperors including both West and East, in the Byzantine period became an ethnic term to include the peoples of the East. Since these were predominantly Greek in culture the name—in its Greek form "Rhomaioi"—came to mean Hellenes.

On page 108 we are reminded that our custom of speaking of Byzantines and a Byzantine Empire is a misnomer, as it does not rest on old linguistic usage, according to which the Byzantines were always the inhabitants of the capital, the Empire being known as Rhomaic and its peoples as Rhomaioi. Survivals of these names still exist in the East, not only in the well-known designation of the modern Greek dialect as Rhomaic, but, in the form *Rûm*, the name of old Rome lives on in Turkish and Arabic. Thus the Turks still call the Greeks by this name, and the Arabs of Syria and Palestine call the Orthodox Greeks by it without reference to nationality, just as they call Roman Catholics *Lâtin*. As the Turks were the inheritors of the political power of the Eastern Empire, the old name in a political sense descended to them. Thus the Seljuk Empire at its foundation at Konia in the eleventh century was called *Rûm*, and the name *Rumili* (Rumelians) still appears in European Turkey. The Sultan is still *Rûm-Pâdischâhi*—Roman Emperor, so his Asiatic subjects and the Turks of Europe are "Rûm-milleti"—Roman people.

In conclusion it may be said without exaggeration that Professor Juethner has laid every student of ancient life and culture under deep obligation by this excellent and authoritative study of the long history of the concepts "Hellene" and "Barbarian".

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE.

Iranians and Greeks in South Russia. By M. ROSTOVTEFF, Hon. D. Litt., Professor in the University of Wisconsin, Member of the Russian Academy of Science. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1922. Pp. xvi, 260. 84 s.)

PROFESSOR ROSTOVTEFF, formerly of the University of Petrograd, has long been recognized as one of the leading authorities in classical archaeol-

ogy and history, and especially in the ancient history of Russia and Asia Minor. His numerous articles and books have made some exceedingly valuable and original contributions, but unfortunately for us several of his writings have been published only in Russian. But now that he is professor of ancient history in the University of Wisconsin, he is publishing many an article in English; and the book under review, though repeating material already published in Russian, is especially welcome to Americans, to many of whom much of this material has been a closed book. To be sure, Minns has published a large volume on *Scythians and Greeks*, in which a complete survey is given of the material illustrating the early history of South Russia and of the views of scholars on the various problems of the history and archaeology of South Russia. Professor Rostovtzeff, however, tries to go farther and give a history of the South Russian lands in the prehistoric, the proto-historic, and the classic periods down to the epoch of the migrations. He defines the part played by South Russia in the history of the world in general, and emphasizes the contributions of South Russia to the civilization of mankind, using especially the rich archaeological evidence furnished by excavations in South Russia. Archaeology is a source of historical information, sometimes even more important than the written sources, and Professor Rostovtzeff has shown perhaps better than any other living professor of ancient history how to write history with the help of archaeology. His results cannot be considered final, since we still know so little of the history and archaeology of Central Asia and of the Iranian world. The exploration of the Caucasian lands and of the upper course of the Euphrates is in its infancy, but Professor Rostovtzeff has blazed a wide trail by showing the importance of the connections with Asia Minor for the development of South Russia, and the importance of South Russia for understanding the main features of the civilization of these lands during the rule of the Scythians and of the Sarmatians of the South Russian steppes. While not denying the Greek influences, he maintains that South Russia always has remained an Oriental land. Hellenism met Orientalism there, but the Oriental stream was the stronger and spread thence all over western Europe.

The attempt to Hellenize the South Russian steppes was not a complete success; much more successful was the attempt to orientalize the semi-Greek world of the northern shores of the Black Sea. In the civilization which the Sarmatians, the Goths, the Huns, brought with them to Western Europe it is the Orient which plays the leading part; the Greek, the Western, and the Northern elements are of but secondary importance.

This is the leading idea of the book, which also has important material for the student of the history of art and especially of the origin of Gothic art, since Professor Rostovtzeff maintains that "South Russia was one of the centres, in which polychromy developed early, and independently of the other centres of ancient jewellery; and assumed special forms which brought about the new style commonly called Gothic".

The book is attractively printed in large type, on good paper, in an appropriate size and beautiful blue binding. The printing has been well done, though in English Kertch is preferable to Kerch, and Chaldean to Chaldian, forms used *passim* in the book. There are thirty-two full-page plates (on p. 171 the reference should be to pl. XXIX., not XXX.), and twenty-three figures with rare illustrations of important works of art, some reproduced for the first time.

After an introduction follow chapters on the Prehistoric Civilizations, the Cimmerians and the Scythians in South Russia (Eighth to Fifth Centuries B.C.), the Greeks on the Shores of the Black Sea down to the Roman Period, the Scythians at the End of the Fourth and in the Third Century B.C., the Sarmatians, the Greek Cities of South Russia in the Roman Period, the Polychrome Style and the Animal Style, the Origin of the Russian State on the Dnieper, bibliography, and index.

The bibliography contains much detailed learning and will be useful to the scholar. On page 235 a reference should have been added to the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, XLIV. (1920) 356, where a better text is given than by Reinach in the *Revue Archéologique*, 1916, page 345.

The book is full of suggestions of questions for investigation; the budding Ph.D. will have no difficulty in getting a subject for a dissertation here. Many sites are mentioned for excavation. On page 82 we read: "One of the most pressing tasks, in the scientific exploration of Asia Minor, is the excavation of the oldest and wealthiest Greek colonies on the southern shore of the Black Sea: Sinope, Amisos, Heracleia." In this connection and where the relations of ancient Russia and Sinope and the southern shore of the Black Sea are treated (p. 162), reference might have been made to my little monograph, *Ancient Sinope*, where especially in the chapter on commerce there is considerable material bearing on Sinope's connections with Olbia, Panticapaeum, etc. (*cf.* my references in *American Journal of Philology*, XXVII. (1906), notes on pp. 136, 137). The book is full of fascinating and original ideas but there is not space to discuss them in detail. Time will test many of them, and I feel convinced that future discoveries will corroborate many of them; perhaps, however, not the thesis that the corbelled vault was continuously employed in Thrace, Greece, and Asia Minor, from the Mycenaean period onwards, for underground buildings and especially for tumular graves. But we are indebted to the learned enthusiasm of Professor Rostovtzeff for an appreciation of South Russian civilization such as has not been available hitherto.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

Storia dei Romani. Per GAETANO DE SANCTIS. Volume IV. *La Fondazione dell'Impero.* Part I. *Dalla Battaglia di Naraggara alla Battaglia di Pidna.* (Turin: Fratelli Bocca. 1922. Pp. xiii, 618. 68 lire.)

THE latest contribution from the pen of Italy's distinguished interpreter of her past carries his narrative of Roman history from 201 to 167 B.C. However, the author has limited himself to an account of the external and internal political history of Rome, reserving for the second part of this volume his discussion of the economic and cultural evolution of this critical period. The main theme of the first part is the establishment of Roman domination in the Mediterranean world, and the first three chapters take up, respectively, Roman predominance in the Balkan peninsula, Roman predominance in Asia Minor, and the fall of the Macedonian Kingdom. In forming his estimate of the policy which led Rome to this career of conquest in the East, De Sanctis rejects Mommsen's judgment that at this time the Romans did not seek to obtain overlordship over the Mediterranean but merely to have harmless neighbors in Greece and Africa; Tenney Frank's characterization of Roman conduct in the Second Macedonian War as "sentimental politics"; and also the view of Carl Peter that it was a policy of hypocrisy and falsehood. Rome, he feels, had nothing to fear from the Greek East; she was free to determine her relations in that quarter as she might choose; and the Second Macedonian War was initiated by the Romans not only without necessity but also without any justification. Thus Rome adopted a policy of aggressive imperialism which led her "step by step to the conquest of the world". Not that the Romans sought new territory at this time, only domination; but in the long run domination without annexation proved an impossibility, for in seeking at the same time Roman domination and the freedom of the Greeks the Roman policy in the East was from the beginning involved in a fatal contradiction. And the Roman conquest lacked the justification of securing to Rome's subjects peace and prosperity; for with foreign domination there began the decline of the economic and moral conditions necessary for the progress of Greek civilization. Furthermore in the Near East the victory of Rome spelt the downfall of Greek political supremacy, the awakening of Oriental nationalism, and the decay of Hellenistic culture. In view of this indictment of Roman imperialism, glorious though its achievements were in the eyes of the Romans and their friends, one understands the author's dedication of his book *a quei pochissimi che hanno parimente a sdegno d'essere oppressi e di farci oppressori.*

Chapter III. is followed by a lengthy appendix (pp. 368-406), which contains a critical examination of chronological problems in connection with the foregoing narrative. In chapter IV. the scene of the story of Roman expansion shifts to the West. Here, De Sanctis finds, a double task awaited the Romans: the recovery and colonization of the Po Valley,

which was a necessary measure of defense for Italy, and the conquest of the Spanish peninsula, which was essential to the safety of the newly acquired Roman province in Spain, a territory which no Roman (and no modern nation) would have thought of surrendering. Had the Romans grasped the importance of this task and developed a systematic plan of military occupation a few decades would have sufficed for the complete conquest of both peninsulas. The occupation of Spain in particular would have greatly hastened the development of civilization there, and have afforded ample room for the settlement of the excess population of Italy, particularly the dispossessed peasantry. But the Romans never devoted serious attention to this problem, owing to the war-weariness of the people as a whole and the preoccupation of the governing classes with their imperialistic schemes in the East. The consequence of this neglect was that spasmodic and unregulated attempts at expansion involved Rome in two centuries of costly frontier wars. And the preoccupation of Roman historians with the brilliant achievements in Greece and Asia caused such a neglect of western affairs that it seems impossible to reconstruct the true story of Rome's western conquests.

The fifth, and concluding, chapter reviews the constitutional development of the period in question. Although the subject is a familiar one and no decidedly new interpretation is advanced, the treatment is fresh and convincing, displaying the same grasp of sources and the same scientific temper which so pleasantly characterize the whole work. The chapter closes with an account of the leading public men and the chief political factions of the time. Here the characterizations of the great rivals, Scipio Africanus and Cato the Elder, are of particular interest. As leader of the senatorial oligarchy Scipio was the champion of the new imperialistic policy adopted by Rome after the Second Punic War, and must be held responsible for the neglect of the internal political and economic problems which confronted the state. As for Cato, in his whole career as a statesman he advocated but one original policy, and that perhaps not his own, namely the extension of Roman colonization in northern Italy, and even beyond the peninsula.

A. E. R. BOAK.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

A History of Magic and Experimental Science during the First Thirteen Centuries of our Era. By LYNN THORNDIKE, Ph.D., Professor of History in Western Reserve University. In two volumes. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1923. Pp. xl, 835; vi, 1036. \$10.00.)

As the author reminds us, it is full twenty years since he began his study of this subject, and eighteen since the Columbia University Press issued his dissertation on *The Place of Magic in the Intellectual History*

of Europe. Already the dissertation was a bright and entertaining lucubration on its theme; but, measured by the vastness of that theme and its sore need of serious treatment, it seemed almost flippant. Happily Dr. Thorndike's study of the history of magic did not end. Fresh contributions from his pen have multiplied, and now it takes these two thick volumes to bring to the close of the thirteenth century his ripened story.

His work is a foundation-laying one. Not that so-called histories of magic have been wanting. Even in the rational eighteenth century the Göttingen Society of Sciences offered a prize for one. Doubtless its aim was mainly the discrediting of magic; and, if so, the Marburg philosopher Tiedemann, who won it with his Latin disputation *De Quaestione quae fuerit Artium Magicarum Origo, quomodo illae ab Asiae Populis ad Graecos atque Romanos et ab his ad ceteras Gentes sint propagatae, quiibus Rationibus adducti fuerint ii qui ad nostra usque Tempora easdem vel defenderent vel oppugnarent*, did not disappoint it. Of quite another trend was the compilation put forth in 1819 (and, swollen, twenty years later) by the mystical Bonn professor Ennemoser under the puzzling title of a history of magnetism—*i.e.*, of animal magnetism, or mesmerism. Translated into English by the Quakers William and Mary Howitt under the more appropriate title of a *History of Magic*, it has doubtless been the one most widely read. If to these two genera one add the writers, largely charlatans, who pose as adepts or devotees of magic, and at the other pole the pious souls who count it all the work of the devil, there is little left. Their books, though legion, are alike of the "omnium gatherum" order, more concerned to entertain than to inform, to preach than to investigate.

It was a great step when in 1860 the eminent French scholar Alfred Maury published his *La Magie et l'Astrologie dans l'Antiquité et au Moyen Age*, though its subtitle, *Etude sur les Superstitions Païennes qui se sont perpétuées jusqu'à nos Jours*, betrays a rationalizing *arrière-pensée*. Magic, however, was not to Maury a mere tissue of fraud and fancy. Though at bottom not a study of nature, but an attempt by rites and formulae to extort her aid, the magician could not deal even thus with her, he thinks, without a growing glimmering of her ways; and the purpose of his little book was but to sketch "the history of this great movement of the human mind which slowly raised us from the shades of magic to the light of modern science". His scholarship laid under tribute a wide range of learning, but a mere sketch his work remains. Dr. Thorndike's could not be better gaged than by comparison. He first has undertaken, as its basis, a survey of the literature. His work, indeed, might almost better be called an introduction to the literature of magic. True, it has not been long that such a survey has been possible. Hidden in secret books, and yet more in secret manuscripts, this literature is even now but slowly drifting into the keeping of great libraries, and no small part of the historian's task has been the finding where it lurks. In each of his volumes a bibliographical index lists these books on magic, and an

index of manuscripts names the whereabouts of their unprinted copies. These count by hundreds, for he has ransacked all Europe, and it is not the least of his services to later study. But there is an enormous and a growing literature besides. Magic touched everything. Anthropology, folk-lore, comparative religion, comparative literature, have vastly broadened our knowledge of it. Assyria, Egypt, all the lands of excavation, have flooded us with magical tablets, papyri, inscriptions. The minuter study of literatures and of religions, especially of that penumbra of religion, the literature called apocryphal, has revealed a myriad doors between religion and magic. To thread this wilderness, all reeking with delusion and with humbug, and lose neither the path nor one's head, needs not only insight and sturdy sense, but stern self-mastery. Dr. Thorndike has not lost himself in the study of origins. A mere glance at prehistory and at the Orient suffices him. Since what concerns him chiefly is the Middle Ages, he will not go back of Pliny for his real starting-point. Theme, like period, he trims to the quick. His is but magic proper. Its popular practice—*i.e.*, sorcery—lies outside his scope. So too do laws against magic and the whole story of witch-persecution. Even the magic that concerns him he will not define, save as "including all occult arts and sciences, superstitions, and folk-lore"; but, as the "occult" clearly limits all four, he has hinted at the best of definitions. Not magic alone, however, is his theme. He "aims to treat the history of magic and experimental science and their relations to Christian thought". The relation to magic of experimental science he will not discuss. Enough that they "have been connected in their development" and that "the history of both can be better understood by studying them together". Such refusal to speculate, even in self-justification, is characteristic. He is at least no doctrinaire. With industry and exactness he has ferreted out and here puts on record the facts he counts fundamental as to the lives, the books, the teachings of those who from Pliny to Cecco d'Ascoli had the fame of magicians or figured in the rise of experimental science. He has seldom found it hard to connect them somehow with both. There is much more to be asked about them, perhaps much more to be learned. A generation hence his work may seem elementary. Already since its publication the comprehensive monograph of Hopfner has put on a new basis our knowledge of Egyptian and Graeco-Roman magic. Dr. Thorndike's own book is sure to fruit in a wealth of further researches. But it is a pioneer achievement that deserves the lasting gratitude of the world of scholars.

GEORGE L. BURR.

Early Sources of Scottish History, A.D. 500 to 1286. Collected and translated by ALAN ORR ANDERSON. In two volumes. (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd. 1922. Pp. clviii, 604; 805. £3 10 s. for the two volumes.)

MR. ANDERSON published in 1908 his *Scottish Annals from English Chroniclers*, in which he translated from chronicles written in England

or by Englishmen, before 1291, passages bearing upon Scottish history from 500 to 1286. The work now under review is a similar collection from chronicles of other nationalities, and from those written later than 1291, where they appear to draw upon early sources of information. The materials, as might be expected, are very largely taken from Celtic and Scandinavian records and annals or from Latin documents written in the Celtic and Scandinavian countries.

After a preface which combines explanations of the author's plan with a rather casual discussion of historical method in general, Mr. Anderson gives an extensive series of bibliographical notes (pp. xxi-ci). For many readers these may prove to be the most useful part of the volume. The sources are there listed, with references to modern editions and treatises, and their age and value discussed. Convenient as these notes will be found, however, the student should be warned that they are uneven and incomplete. For example, whereas the *Annals of Ulster* are very adequately treated, full account being taken of the historical study of the language, the *Annals of Tigernach* are dismissed with no mention of the recent investigations of MacNeill, Thurneysen, and Best (in *Eriu*, VII., and the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, X.). Similarly, there is no reference under *Lébor na h-Uidre* to the studies of its compilation by Zimmer and Thurneysen or to the palaeographical investigation of Best, and in the case of the *Liber Hymnorum* the latest edition of the Irish hymns, in Stokes and Strachan's *Thesaurus Palacohibernicus*, is not mentioned. In fact the account of the *Liber Hymnorum* is in one respect even misleading. Mr. Anderson cites, without question or comment, Dr. Bernard's opinion that the text of the hymns is not older than that of the notes and glosses. The statement is doubtless true of the existing manuscript copies of the hymns, to which Dr. Bernard apparently meant to apply it. But the implication of Mr. Anderson's paragraph, which also quotes a remark of Dr. Atkinson's about the occurrence of Middle Irish forms in the hymns, is that the entire work—hymns, introductions, and glosses—was a production of the Middle Irish period. This is certainly not the present opinion of Celtic scholars. The hymns, although somewhat modernized by the copyists, are generally recognized as belonging to the period of the Old Irish glosses. Stokes and Strachan included them in their *Thesaurus*, even restoring Old Irish forms, to the improvement of rhyme and metre, and Thurneysen has drawn material from them for his Old Irish grammar. Dr. Atkinson himself, in spite of his recognition of Middle Irish features in the text, says—what few other Celts have been willing to assert—that the Lorica, *Atomring indiu*, is probably a genuine relic of St. Patrick. (See Bernard and Atkinson's edition, II. Iviii.) The language of the glosses, on their side, has been examined by Professor G. Dottin (*Revue Celtique*, XXXI. 288 ff.), who puts an interval of at least two centuries between them and the hymns. Facts and opinions like these should have been noted by Mr. Anderson,

and because of such omissions it will be necessary for students of his notes to make supplementary use of other Celtic bibliographies.

In the body of the work excerpts from the chronicles are set down in chronological order under the years to which they refer. Some of the citations are very brief—mere notices of births and deaths, battles, and various events. Others are long and circumstantial pieces of narrative or description. Extensive use, for example, is made of Adamnan's *Vita Columbae*, of Turgot's life of Queen Margaret, and of the *Chronicle of Melrose*. The materials are well selected and the translations made with care. Though many of the documents had been translated before, Mr. Anderson has not been contented simply to accept the work of predecessors. Doubtful passages, variant readings, and such matters he discusses fully in his notes, where his own knowledge of Irish is often turned to good account. Much labor is also expended on the identification of persons and places, the correction of dates, the comparison of authorities, and the determination of sources. Because of the careful annotation the work will often prove serviceable to the historical specialist. But it was not primarily intended for his use. The author aimed rather to provide the general reader or student with an introduction to the sources of Scottish history, and he fully realized (as he remarks in the preface) that the investigator would go beyond translations to the original documents.

F. N. ROBINSON.

Aspects of the Italian Renaissance. By RACHEL ANNAND TAYLOR.
With a preface by GILBERT MURRAY. (Boston and New York:
Houghton Mifflin Company. 1923. Pp. 302. \$3.00.)

If the modern scientific method, a well co-ordinated plan, and the viewpoint regarding the character of the social process which obtains among present-day scholars are the indispensable requirements of a good history, it would have to be conceded that Mrs. Taylor's book stands self-condemned. But if there is salvation outside the ruling formulas, if a work may still be history, and good history, when, instead of building up a solid edifice of facts, it occupies itself with the spirit behind the facts in the hope of communicating the color and perfume of a segment of human experience, this book can be confidently recommended not only to the notoriously unscientific lovers of the Renaissance but to those grave and reverend signors, the professional historians themselves. Mrs. Taylor follows in the footsteps of Symonds, or better yet, may for purposes of reference be bracketed with Pater. For there is in her book a sensitive response to the fiery aspirations and passionate performances, to the subtle, devious, and rapturous self-realization of the Renaissance proclaiming a kinship with that inwardly illuminated Oxford don, to whom it was given to penetrate to the very inner shrine of the most alluring period of European culture. We may therefore agree that no one should turn to these pages for a record of occurrences organized according to

some clear-cut theory of social evolution. Indeed the objective facts are for the most part taken for granted, and what we get is their subjective evaluation by a remarkably eager mind, for which the Renaissance, as it is the most venturesome, represents also the noblest effort of the human race to set its flag among the stars. Thought sustained at this severe level must needs clothe itself in language of a flexible and imaginative texture. While it is certain that Mrs. Taylor sometimes nods, it is also true that her utterance is unusually delicate and passionate, culminating in its happiest moments in sharply etched silhouettes or colorful epigrams as striking as they are memorable. But, we may ask, what, in a volume of loosely strung essays, is the function of the chronological tables at the end of the chapters? Do they represent an effort hurriedly to bring up the forgotten baggage of facts in order by this means to enable the volume to qualify for the diverting and eminently American steeplechase staged by the associated publishers of text-books? Be that as it may, these lists of haphazard dates are dumped in their place with a rumble like a load of coal dropped on a summer sidewalk and make about as handsome and appropriate a showing in the perspective of the book.

Confronted with the appraisal of a defined epoch, we are properly curious as to the freshness of the author's interpretation. Truth to tell, Mrs. Taylor's reading of her period is not so novel as it is refined and intellectual. It pivots on the human mind, which is the real, though invisible, protagonist of her unfolding drama. No word here about those battle-horses of the modern democratic historian, the economic forces and the mute, suffering masses of humanity. The Renaissance, to Mrs. Taylor's way of thinking, was a purely spiritual enterprise, and as such concerned only a small group of highly endowed men, politicians, poets, artists, and philosophers, who with extraordinary single-mindedness pursued the one great aim of developing their personalities to the utmost, of gathering as much beauty as their arms could grasp, in a word, of acquiring each one his own individual style. To this passionately aristocratic society nothing can be conceivably more opposed than our own age with its soft humanitarianism and its worship of the greatest number. And yet—who will solve the riddle? We are always looking back at the Renaissance in bewildered admiration, and when one of our number tries his hand at presenting its portrait, he does so, exactly like Mrs. Taylor, with the all but avowed declaration that he considers himself much better employed than if he were drawing the commonplace and self-satisfied physiognomy of our time.

FERDINAND SCHEVILL.

Die Kulturwerte der Deutschen Literatur in ihrer Geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Von KUNO FRANCKE. Zweiter Band. Von der Reformation bis zur Aufklärung. (Berlin: Weidmann. 1923. Pp. xiv, 638.)

It is the purpose of the present opulent volume to trace the strands of moral, political, and social causality which wove the tragic web of

German life from Luther to Lessing—in so far at least as the study of literature proves helpful in this difficult task. We are thus brought face to face with perhaps the most poignant exhibitions of social waste found in the whole range of human history.

The same Germany which in the fifteenth century could draw from Enea Silvio exclamations of unstinted admiration and respect, within a hundred and fifty years experienced the complete dislocation of her spiritual, economic, and intellectual existence. After the blasts of energy which meet us from the "Volkslied" and from Luther's early pronouncements, after the jewelled elegance of Erasmus's essays and the disciplined aggressiveness of Hutten's poems and dialogues, after the promise of a great new freedom implied in the writings of all three—the bickerings of the sects and consequent disintegration in political life and hardening of arteries in intellectual life, absence of inspiration in drama, decreasing care in the treatment of prose and verse, a sense of fatigue on all sides. Invective crowds out critical discussion, party hatred, to which even Luther falls victim, stifles a large humaneness. Then in the seventeenth century comes that foul war of thirty years for which the foundations had been carefully laid by previous generations. At its close utter exhaustion seems to preclude possibility of recovery even in a misty future—especially as France further mangles the bleeding invalid. In the meantime Absolutism had risen and was holding the throttle of industrial and spiritual life in all countries, and perhaps most effectively in Germany with its multitude of petty courts. Hence literature loses contact with the soil. Drama, lyrical poetry, the novel, all breathe artificiality and servility and lack the originality born of a strong national consciousness. Apparently by 1650 the knell of German culture had been rung. Yet against this gray background what surprisingly colorful figures prove the indestructible vitality of the German race: in the sixteenth century Hans Sachs, the shoemaker-poet of Nürnberg with his deep human sympathy and imperishable humor, and Johann Fischart, after Hutten the most versatile publicist on the Protestant side; a generation later the astronomer Kepler, one of the most fearless pathfinders in modern science; and two decades after him that Grimmelshausen whose realistic novel *Simplicius Simplicissimus* (1668) gives us a seizing picture of the horrors of the most horrible religious war on record. And now it appears that the deep-welling sorrow caused by this struggle had tortured the German soul into utmost intensity of spiritual life. The mystic visions of a Jacob Boehme (about 1625), the religious verse of a Gerhardt and a von Spee (about 1650), sects like the Pietists—all help to explain the emotional sublimity of a Bach and the deep inwardness of a Leibniz. Immediately after them begins that great heave in politics, letters, philosophy, and music, made possible and encouraged by Frederick the Great, Klopstock, Wieland, and especially Lessing, which was to culminate in that vital increment in the culture of western races, the works of Goethe, Kant, and Beethoven.

This almost miraculous reversal from beggary to sublimity is evoked in the book before us with a force, clarity, control of material, limpidity of style which deserve the highest praise and make of these chapters a superior contribution to the study of modern culture.

CAMILLO VON KLENZE.

*Joan Derk van der Capellen: Staatkundig Levensbeeld uit de II'ord-
ingstijd van de Moderne Demokratie in Nederland.* Door MURK
DE JONG HENDRIKSZON. (Groningen and the Hague: J. B.
Wolters' U. M. 1921. Pp. viii, 782.)

THIS book, according to the preface, is the fruit of many years of study by the author, and, indeed, the great mass of information it contains is proof of long and thorough research. It is not a strict biography as might be implied from the title—the hero is sometimes lost sight of entirely—but rather a survey of political life in the United Provinces of the Netherlands at the time of the so-called Patriots, of whom Joan Derk van der Capellen was the foremost champion. Both the man and the time have been the object of special studies before. De Jong Hendrikszoon, however, not only contributes many facts not generally known hitherto, but also corrects views of other authors on the same subject which he considers either partial or erroneous. He differs, e.g., in essential points from van der Kemp (*Historie der Admissie*, etc.) and Colenbrander (*De Patriottentijd*).

New is the author's account of the rise of democracy in the Netherlands. It is true the conception of democracy by van der Capellen, its originator in his country, is not quite identical with the use of the term in our time. His original theory excluded large portions of the people from essential political rights, although he wished all true Dutch citizens finally to share the same rights. His principles of democracy included freedom of the press voicing the will of the people, free political meetings, inviolability of the people's representatives, and their responsibility to the people only. De Jong Hendrikszoon, therefore, justly maintains that van der Capellen's name should be mentioned with honor among the pioneers of modern liberalism. He denies, however, that the "Patriottentijd" was the forerunner of the French Revolution.

The second chapter contains an explanation of sovereignty in the United Provinces, a matter highly intricate and difficult to understand.

The book repeatedly touches upon the relations between the United Provinces and the new republic in America, without however contributing anything new of interest. Van der Capellen's many efforts to assist the American cause in the United Provinces are well known. Still de Jong Hendrikszoon thinks that the "Holland Society" of America in placing a memorial tablet on van der Capellen's house in Zwolle (on June 6, 1908) greatly exaggerated his services for the establishment of American independence, and he goes so far as to call their action upon this occasion

untrue and unworthy ("de onware en onwaardige huldevertoning van 1908").

While the book is excellently written and, in general, forms a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the "Patriottentijd", its conclusions are not always convincing. The author's conception of van der Capellen's dual morality (a higher and a lower centre), by which he explains all of his shortcomings, seems rather artificial. He furthermore often puts his views forward too strongly instead of allowing the facts to speak their own language. A detailed table of contents is given, but an alphabetical index would have added to the usefulness of the book. A number of errata should be eliminated in a subsequent edition.

FR. EDLER.

La Constitution Civile du Clergé et la Crise Religieuse en Alsace (1790-1795) d'après des Documents en partie inédits. By RODOLPHE REUSS, Professeur Honoraire à l'Université de Strasbourg. In two volumes. [Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, fascicules 7, 8.] (Strasbourg and Paris: Istra. 1922. Pp. vi, 378; 378. 15 fr. each.)

THE fateful influence upon the course of the French Revolution exerted by the Constituent Assembly's experiments in ecclesiastical reorganization has long been a recognized fact. The extreme complexity of the problem becomes evident, however, only after a study of the local application of the laws. The religious history of Alsace, which was formed into the two departments of the Bas Rhin and the Haut Rhin, is particularly rich in such illustrative material, as the distinguished author of these volumes abundantly shows. There were two special conditions which affected the situation in that region. The first was the presence of many Protestants, mainly in the Bas Rhin, of which Strasbourg was the capital. There was no provision in the Civil Constitution of the Clergy by which Protestants, Jews, or even atheists, were excluded from the electoral assemblies when these were called upon to choose bishops. The same embarrassment affected the procedure for the choice of parish priests. The second difficulty touched the clerical candidates themselves. It was necessary that they should be German-speaking, because German was the language spoken especially in the rural parishes. Professor Reuss explains that in the Haut Rhin the Protestants were commonly in favor of abstaining, but in the Bas Rhin, where the political struggle was more acute, the radicals were urgent in pressing them to take part. There the curious argument was made that, as the Protestant electors had been chosen in part at least by Catholics, they should act, for otherwise they would deprive their Catholic constituents of a just share in the choice of the new bishop. The language difficulty was lessened by the attempt to recruit the clergy from among those German priests who were attracted to Alsace by sympathy with revolutionary ideas. Professor

Reuss thinks there were more than forty of these German or Austrian recruits. The movement soon ceased because of the hostility of their parishioners. "Au lieu de l'Eldorado qu'ils rêvaient", says the author, "ils trouvèrent des injures et parfois des coups." Some returned whence they came, others abandoned their religious vocation and plunged into the Revolutionary current. The most notorious of these figures was Jean-George (Euloge) Schneider, who had been court preacher at Stuttgart and more recently professor at Bonn. Professor Reuss does not portray him as "un tigre, altéré de sang", as other French writers have, but as an ambitious, cowardly, unscrupulous individual, ready to use his unusual facility of speech in advancing his fortunes or in the more sober task of saving his life. The author's sympathies are evidently with the moderates, who tried to practise toleration in the controversies which the schism brought on. He quotes at length an interesting pronouncement of the directory of the Bas Rhin, a memorandum sent to the Legislative Assembly in January, 1792, showing the difficulties under which they were laboring. Its tone reflects credit upon their practical wisdom. They were compromised, however, in the sudden overthrow of the monarchy, and a group of extremists, supported by recruits from the neighboring French departments, obtained control. Some of these radicals even talked of expelling the Alsatian population and re-settling the country with sans-culottes. Professor Reuss has little respect for them or for their leaders in Paris. He deprecates the idea that France was saved from the perils of 1793 by such men and protests against the "légende, toujours encore répétée, qui, de ces révolutionnaires épileptiques, a fait des héros antiques ou des grands hommes d'État". One of the incidental consequences of the religious struggle upon which these volumes throw new light is the transfer of the records of civil status from the priesthood to the local authorities. But this is not the only subject which the author's unrivalled knowledge of Alsatian history has elucidated. The whole work is a notable contribution to the religious history of the Revolution.

H. E. BOURNE.

History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century. By HEINRICH VON TREITSCHKE. Translated by EDEN and CEDAR PAUL. Volumes I.-VII., with Introductions by WILLIAM HARROD DAWSON. (New York: Robert C. McBride and Company. 1915-1919. Pp. xix, 708; xiv, 724; xiii, 664; xx, 644; xiv, 653; xiv, 670; xiv, 632. \$3.25 per volume.)

TREITSCHKE'S monumental work, of which the last volume appeared in 1894, should have been translated into English long ago. In the edition now provided, deference to the taste of English readers, who demand pages less crowded and eye-straining than German thrift permits, has expanded the five original volumes into seven. The translation, so far as the reviewer has tested it, is accurate, and it is often felicitous. Each volume is fully indexed.

The point at which Treitschke's history really begins—the date at which the narrative becomes detailed and comprehensive—is 1814. But, as Maitland says, the historian who attempts a sharp delimitation of periods "tears a seamless web". In an Introduction, which in the English edition fills the first volume, the author at first outlines, then treats with increasing fullness, the history of Germany, and especially that of Prussia, from the Peace of Westphalia to the close of the Napoleonic wars. The six following volumes carry the story only through the year 1847. Of Treitschke's five volumes, the last two appeared after lengthening intervals, because, as he explained in his last preface, he was afflicted with "an obstinate disorder of the eyes"; and when he died, at the age of sixty-two, the great work of his life was but half completed. After devoting fifteen years to the story of the wanderings of his people in the desert of disunity, it was to him a tragic disappointment to be forced to renounce the hope of describing their militant and triumphant entry into the promised land. "Who", he asked, "will finish my history?" His history, of course, no other writer can finish; but the European revolutions of the mid-century and the founding of the German Empire have already been well described, and will be redescribed, with the advantage of a longer perspective, by historians yet unborn. The drab story of a stagnant (although in no wise unhappy) Germany from 1815 to 1848 will attract few specialists: it will be told only in general histories and only in outline. For the writers of such histories Treitschke's work will remain indispensable, and for readers of history it will not soon, if ever, be superseded.

Although by birth a Saxon, between whose little fatherland and Prussia there had been long antagonism and repeated warfare, Treitschke early accepted the view that Germany could be unified only under the hegemony of Prussia; and at a time when this programme, which meant a lesser Germany, from which Austria's German territories must be excluded, was extremely unpopular in the smaller German states, he had been its outspoken advocate. Given this initial conviction and the ensuing demonstration of its validity, it is unthinkable that Treitschke should have viewed modern German history from any other angle than the Prussian.

A further conviction, and one for which there was less apparent reason, determined the tone in which this history was to be written. Treitschke believed that the German people, even after 1871, did not properly appreciate itself. It was accordingly his frankly avowed purpose to develop German patriotism. In the preface to his first volume he declared that the narrator of German history should "himself feel and should know how to awaken in the hearts of his readers . . . a delight in the fatherland". And in the preface to his fourth volume: "Much water will flow down the Rhine before foreigners will permit us to speak of our country with the pride that has ever characterised the treatises on national history composed by Englishmen and by Frenchmen."

One of the most primitive and yet always most effective methods of

stimulating patriotism is to cultivate contempt and hatred of the foreigner. This method Treitschke continually employed, in his lectures to German students as in his writings. Its use, however, was not the outcome of calculation. Treitschke himself entertained the feelings he strove to arouse. Of Austria, in spite of its acceptance of defeat and its alliance with the German Empire, he writes, except when he notes Austrian contributions to German science, literature, and art, with unvarying contempt. Great Britain was to him, as to many French writers, perfidious. Its policy was always determined by its trade interests. Russia was barbaric; and in its rulers, in spite of their Teutonic blood, Oriental cunning had become instinctive. France was decadent. Treitschke intimates that by the battle of Sedan France was as definitely ousted from its position as a leading European power as was Spain in the seventeenth century by the Peace of the Pyrenees (V. 4).

Against the national bias with which Treitschke writes, and against the injustice of many of his judgments, Mr. Dawson, himself an expert in the field of German history, endeavors to give the readers of this translation some degree of immunity. His introductions—there is one in each volume—are more than fair, they are sympathetic; but where it seems necessary they are critical and corrective.

In justice to Treitschke it should be recognized that, in so far as his national bias and his personal prejudices permitted, he was fair, both in his praise and in his censure. He was essentially honest; and in the preface to his first volume he treats the duty of awakening a delight in the fatherland as but half of the task of the German historian. The other half is to indicate the connection of events and to "express his opinions with frankness" (I. xv). A high degree of frankness is in fact exhibited both in his critical comments upon Prussian kings and statesmen, and in his censure of unlovely traits in the German national character. Frederick William I. was a man of "Boeotian roughness", "the scorn and the terror of his contemporaries" (I. 54, 43). Of Frederick the Great he writes: "The central characteristic of this powerful nature was his pitiless and cruel German realism" (I. 57). Frederick William II. "was devoid of the expert knowledge, the enduring industry, the security of judgment, and the firm vigor of will, which were demanded by his difficult office" (I. 120). Frederick William IV. was "a prince capable of arousing the highest possible expectations, and yet unable to fulfil any of them" (II. 443). He was simply an unusually brilliant dilettante (VI. 298, 304).

In censuring the faults of his beloved German people Treitschke is equally frank. Recognizing what most of the later apostles of German culture ignore, he says: "It was Catholicism which had trained our people for civilisation" (I. 6); and he was fully conscious of the fact, which Goethe openly stated, that the Mediterranean civilization had made its way only slowly and imperfectly into German life. When he describes "the blustering activity of the valiant Jahn" in developing German ath-

letics and in stimulating German patriotism, he tells us that the influence of this "noisy barbarian" upon the youth of Germany was "all the more harmful in that the Teuton is spontaneously inclined to mistake coarseness for frankness" (I. 358). In the first chapter devoted to German literature he writes: "Once only in this northern land was there a passable cultivation of the general sense of form: in the days of the Hohenstaufen . . . Since those days, at every stage in the development of German civilisation, there has been displayed a hideous foundation of unrestrained barbarism" (I. 104).

While Treitschke's history is primarily political, the chapters devoted to public affairs are by no means wholly political in the narrow sense of the term. He deals, when this is necessary, with public finance. He recognizes the importance of economic factors in the national life. His description of the development of the German customs union is thorough and minute. It is not likely to be bettered. And a very large portion of his book is not political but social history. In every period he deals with religious movements, with education, with the progress of science, and with the development of the fine arts. To German literature he allots what to many historians would seem disproportionate space. If the chapters devoted to this subject were printed separately, they would instantly be recognized as forming one of the best histories of modern German literature yet written. Not only does he illuminate the literary activity of each period by showing its relation to the political, the religious, and the social life of the time, as he did in his remarkable early essay on Milton, but he also criticizes the work of Germany's writers from the purely artistic point of view, and with authority, since he was himself one of the great masters of German prose.

It is after all the literary quality that determines the fate of books, even of histories. Treitschke's writings will long be read, not only because of his fire, his wit, his mordant sarcasm, and his power to coin the unforgettable phrase, but also because he had that sense of form which he found so often lacking in the literature of his nation. If he writes as an advocate rather than as an impartial judge, it should be remembered that many, if not most, of the histories that have proved viable have the same fault. But what makes Treitschke's history most readable is the emphasis he places upon the human factor. He of course recognizes the continuous influence of the past upon the present (V. 3), but he asserts that "men control the course of events" (VI. 297), and that "man makes history" (I. 32). Not only because of this belief, but also because he was himself so very human, he was intensely interested in the personal traits of the men who shaped history and of the men who wrote great books. He gives us in this history an extraordinary number of striking portraits—portraits of rulers and of statesmen, German and foreign, and of many German writers. Some of these portraits are perhaps unduly softened, some are etched with a patriotic resentment that is almost hate, but all are works of art.

MUNROE SMITH.

The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy, 1783-1919. Edited by Sir A. W. WARD, Litt.D., F.B.A., and G. P. GOOCH, M.A., Litt.D. In three volumes. Volume II., 1815-1866. (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company, 1923. Pp. xviii, 688. 31 s. 6 d.)

THE review of the first volume of this work touched mainly on those chapters which referred to British-American relations. For this second volume the same method is followed since it is impossible even to indicate the treatment of the many European points of contact of British foreign policy from 1815 to 1866. In brief it may be said that while each contributor presents his material in his own way there does run through the whole story a consistency (intentional with the editors) in representing a national point of view as regards the interests and honor of Great Britain. The central thread is the situation in Continental Europe. For nearly all topics the text and the bibliographies show that the writers have had access to Foreign Office despatches to about 1864—a fact in itself indicating the value in new material of this work.

Turning to British-American relations, the chapters of interest are Great Britain and the Continental Alliance, by W. Alison Phillips; the Foreign Policy of Canning, by H. W. V. Temperley; United States and Colonial Developments, and Anglo-American Relations during the Civil War, both by A. P. Newton. The first two of these necessarily bring in the relations with the United States under Castlereagh and Canning and centre upon the backgrounds, pronouncement, and after-effects of the Monroe Doctrine. There is little new light on this, though the "Memorandum" of the conversation between Polignac and Canning, now printed for the first time in full, is interesting as showing that when Polignac urged an international conference on the Spanish-American question, Canning countered by stating that he did not see how the United States could be omitted from the call for such a conference. In general both Phillips and Temperley credit Castlereagh with wisdom and generosity in dealing with America and with as essential an opposition to the Quadruple Alliance "system" of interpositions in the affairs of minor states as had Canning himself. To Castlereagh, writes Phillips, "this principle appeared to lead immediately to the creation of a species of General Government in Europe, with a superintending Directory, destructive of all correct notions of internal Sovereign authority" (p. 39). Castlereagh's acts laid the foundations for British policy toward the revolted Spanish colonies and both here and in European affairs his rehabilitation, begun some twenty years ago, would appear to have been completed by the present work.

It is curious that with this emphasis on Great Britain's opposition to the "system" of interpositions there should still be evident in the work of so careful a scholar as Temperley a failure to understand the very meat of Monroe's message of December, 1823. Even when quoting the

part of that message which deals with "interposition" as the "political system" of the Allied powers, Temperley in his "three principles" of the Monroe Doctrine omits the greatest of Monroe's objections—the right of a sovereign state to determine its own internal organization and life or, as President Wilson put it, declaring that he hoped to see adopted in Europe the great principle of the Monroe doctrine—"the right of self-determination".

In general, however, the chapters by Phillips and Temperley, when treating of American relations, are scholarly and are based on much study of documents. Those by Newton are compact, readable, and correctly present incidents and interests in a general way, but are founded wholly on secondary authorities (mostly American) and occasionally are in error in statement of minor points. Newton had the more difficult task, for the relations covered have hitherto had little interest for British historians. His chapters in this volume are evidence of a recognition that relations with America should long since have received more extensive study. A few inconsistencies and errors must be noted. Newton cites (p. 234), from a secondary work, Canning's opposition to the Monroe Doctrine in the language cited by Temperley (p. 75) from the Foreign Office archives, with a difference of date. Of the three Southern commissioners to England, 1861, Mann was not present at the first interview with Russell (p. 495)—although Russell later carelessly wrote of his presence. Russell did not write Everett (p. 497) "for God's sake, let us, if possible, keep out of it"; he said it in Parliament. It is an error to state (p. 16) in reference to the neutrality acts passed at nearly the same time by Great Britain and the United States in the early part of the century that nothing was done previous to 1861 to improve them. The United States amended her Neutrality Act in 1838 and in exactly that sense on account of which she later complained of Great Britain for neglect of neutral duty. But these are minor points. More serious is the complete failure to understand the significance of the controversy from 1815 to 1830 over West Indian trade. Huskisson, in Parliament, made this very clear when he acknowledged that American "retaliation" had forced an alteration of the British colonial system. Yet, dependent on American writers, Newton cannot be blamed for skimping this topic, an essay upon which (still unpublished) has but just recently been awarded a prize by the American Historical Association.

The treatment in Newton's two chapters will have to be revised, but this is not to say that it is badly done. Except for the questions of Texas annexation and the Central-American troubles of 1850-1860, the chapters cover new ground, no doubt prohibiting, for lack of time, any thorough study of Foreign Office materials on America. The result is, on the whole, a good summary, eminently fair and straightforward, but not conclusive. In the preface to volume I. the editors, with a view to " vindicate for British Foreign Policy" a "claim to consistency", have explained their selection of none but British writers. This being so, the

comment of American students will be that the real merit of the work for British-American relations lies in the fact that the importance of those relations to Great Britain herself has at last been appreciated and full space and attention given them.

E. D. ADAMS.

Histoire du Peuple Anglais au XIX^e Siècle. II. Du Lendemain de Waterloo à la Veille du Reform Bill (1815-1830). Par ÉLIE HALÉVY, Professeur à l'École Libre des Sciences Politiques. (Paris: Hachette. 1923. Pp. xii, 291. 25 fr.)

IT is ten years since M. Halévy first interested students of nineteenth-century England by volume I. of this work. The second volume, carrying the narrative from 1815 to 1830, will be received with at least a respectful curiosity, owing to the impression created by the first. For M. Halévy with the tradition of the Continental revolution in his mind saw in the case of England an instance of political stability amidst the European chaos; and he propounded the question, how the stability may be explained. Almost by divination, he found an answer by suggesting that in England the state had foregone strict religious uniformity in favor of toleration; the nonconformist chapel absorbed revolutionary ardor that on the Continent would not have left the state in peace. The thesis is plausible; and it brought M. Halévy the reputation of having thrown a new light on a fundamental issue. Also, M. Halévy's work was more than a composite of accepted English authorities put into French. It was an original contribution from the study of an independent French scholar.

In this latter respect the author's treatment of the post-Napoleonic era in England and of the rise of liberalism is continued on the same high level of original scholarship, particularly in the use of contemporary journals and periodicals for material. But in other respects the present volume must bring to its readers a shade of disappointment. Perhaps a preoccupation with the war may have dulled the freshness of an interest in material laboriously acquired and mastered only perforce to be set aside to wait for later arrangement and presentation. But there is about this second volume something more than the manner of a perfunctory fulfilment of a task long left unfinished. There is the air of a scholar speaking not exactly in terms of disdain but with a chill detachment, as though too polite to betray annoyance, yet nevertheless deeply vexed. In other words the echo of a passing international estrangement seems to haunt the narrative, and to leave the reader feeling that many things pertinent to present-day differences are to be read between the lines.

In regard to arrangement the volume divides the period 1815 to 1830 into two parts—naming the first the Era of Castlereagh, the second the Break-Up of the Tory Party. The use of the former serves to make Castlereagh the mainspring of an entire epoch; the use of the latter re-

duces Canning to a subsidiary place in a season of political drift. This depreciation of Canning is intentional, and it marks a distinctive point of the volume. It is refreshing to have the Monroe Doctrine explained as a rebuff to Canning, even without reference to American sources, though if a writer is engaged deliberately in belittling Canning he would do well not to overlook the *Hindham Papers*. But the climax is reached when Canning is described as a *roturier*! Technically the word is correctly employed; but may not M. Halévy have had in mind a living and popular English statesman, whose early career so little resembles Canning's sophisticated patrician breeding? Here and there in the volume are episodes insufficiently presented. For example, the alleged assault upon the Prince Regent that prompted the Six Acts is disposed of as "obscure". It would be less obscure if M. Halévy had asked: Was anyone ever apprehended and charged with the assault; and was the missile alleged to have been thrown ever produced? Again, the fatalities at Peterloo are given summarily as eleven! Would that all controverted questions could be disposed of as simply. On Castlereagh's suicide reference might have been made to the most circumstantial account in Chateaubriand's *Memoirs*.

As between the two volumes that M. Halévy has completed the first is the more notable contribution. The commonplace Toryism that forms the theme of the second is obviously not congenial to M. Halévy's temperament. It is perhaps unfortunate that he felt obliged to write on the subject in order to make his study of nineteenth-century England complete.

C. E. FRYER.

Cavour et l'Unité Italienne avant 1848. Par PAUL MATTER, Professeur à l'École des Sciences Politiques. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1922. Pp. iv, 364. 20 fr.)

As a life of Cavour this is not a great contribution to Risorgimento history—though it is useful, particularly for those unfamiliar with the Italian and English languages, in which the recent standard biographies of Cavour have been published; the best lives which have previously appeared in French, by Guillaume de la Rive, Cavour's Swiss relative and intimate friend (1862), and by Charles de Mazade (1877), while still valuable, are quite out of date.

Relative importance, however, may be credited to Matter's volume, derived from unpublished documents in the Archives des Affaires Étrangères in Paris, to which the writer had access—namely, the despatches of the successive representatives of France in Turin, Marquis de la Tour du Pin, Baron de Barante, Marquis de Rumigny, Count Mortier, Baron de Bourgoing, Baron d'André, and others, together with reports of French consuls in Genoa. But these despatches are not given in full, on the contrary they are quoted with the utmost brevity; the best of those of Barante were already published a quarter of a century ago in the fourth

and fifth volumes of his *Souvenirs*. The quotations, though containing scarcely any references to Cavour, are of some interest upon contemporary conditions and events in Piedmont. Matter does not always show critical discernment in the use of the despatches, taking it too much for granted that what the French diplomats state is of necessity true. For example, he declares that Genoa, with the return of peace and its annexation to the kingdom of Piedmont, began to develop steadily under the able direction of the governor, Marquis d'Yennes (p. 74), and he quotes two optimistic lines from a despatch of de la Tour du Pin of 1824, which are quite misleading in this regard. The truth is that commercial conditions in Genoa at the time were very bad, and that poor trade augmented the Genoese spirit of political unrest which developed such revolutionists as Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Cavour's *Incognita*.

Matter has studied Gualterio, Farini, Vimercati, and others who wrote a half-century and more ago, but his volume indicates ignorance of most of the more recent standard works and primary sources upon the general history of Piedmont and of Italy. He has used freely the recent standard biographies of Cavour by Ruffini (*La Giovinezza*) and by Thayer (*The Life and Times*), but his ethical sense has not led him to acknowledge his full indebtedness to these authors. For example, it would have been useful to the reader to know that Bombelle's letter to Sedelinski of October 2, 1832, which Matter quotes as preserved at the Ministry of the Interior in Vienna (p. 87), was published in Ruffini's *La Giovinezza*, I, 140. It may be noted in this connection that Italian historians of the Risorgimento have to-day, themselves, a high ethical standard in citing sources of information. Unless governed by such a standard, foot-notes, while of unquestionable use to the reader, may easily create a false estimate of the real preparation and scholarship of the historian.

The student will note in this work an unaccountable silence upon Cavour's first personal experience of Austrian hostility, to which Ruffini has dedicated important pages of *La Giovinezza* (I, 138 ff.) and regarding which Francesco Salata has quite recently published—too recently for use by Matter—an important study with new documents in the *Nuova Antologia* (June 16, 1923). Equal silence has also been preserved with regard to Cavour's letters to Cesare Balbo published in the *Nuova Antologia* (January 16, 1914), although Matter refers to a fragment of one of them, briefly, as given in an antiquarian's Paris catalogue.

Matter's quotations from unpublished French diplomatic despatches as to the high esteem in which Cavour's father was held in Piedmont as *vicario* (prefect) of Turin are important. We are beginning to understand today that Cavour's political genius was in part inherited.

The biographer's style is unattractive, and his pages contain no brilliant passages indicating either profound insight into Italian character or mature valuation of events. The volume is written, however, with a sympathetic attitude toward the Italian liberal movement which achieved

unity, and it should be useful in promoting French understanding of Modern Italy.

H. NELSON GAY.

History of Modern Europe, 1878-1919. By G. P. GOOCH, D.Litt.
(London: Cassell and Company, Ltd.; New York: Henry Holt
and Company. 1923. Pp. vii, 728, 21 s.)

DR. GOOCH calls his book "a continuation of Fyffe's admirable *History of Modern Europe, 1792-1878*"; but it is less comprehensive, for it ignores domestic politics and economic problems, and deals only with diplomatic history. To attempt "a study of the European system which perished in the flames of the Great War" is almost like the labors of Sisyphus, for since the book was written, Messrs. Asquith and Churchill have published their explanations, and so it will continue. Nevertheless students and publicists will be grateful for this straightforward narrative based on the voluminous material released since 1918, all the more so because the new sources are being frequently exploited in an unscientific or unscrupulous manner; and this dispassionate analysis may be recommended to all whose knowledge of recent history is derived from current manuals.

Dr. Gooch contents himself with stating what happened, with frequent quotations from documents and with enough running comment to carry the reader along; there is little discussion of controversial questions or interpretation of policies. But the interaction of aggressive imperialism, the system of alliances, and the accumulation of armaments is clearly revealed, and he shows conclusively that "though the conduct of each of the belligerents [in 1914] appeared devilish to its enemies, yet in every case it was precisely what might have been expected" (p. 554).

The British case is not unnaturally defended and the charge of aggressive intent denied, but it is recognized that "we were . . . conditionally involved in the quarrels and ambitions of a distant Power [Russia] over whose policy we exercised no control" (p. 499) and that the statement in Parliament in June, 1914, about the Anglo-Russian naval convention offers a "problem in casuistry" (p. 531). It is conceded that England was in honor bound to France (p. 559), but there is no discussion of the positive assertions in Russian documents that a promise, albeit verbal, had been given of military assistance in the event of war with Germany and that the neutrality formula proposed by Germany in 1912 was rejected because of French opposition. M. Poincaré is absolved from the charge of desiring war, but it is remarked that in 1914 "the French Government played a strangely passive part" (p. 547). The account of Russian policy in the Balkans and toward the Straits is very complete, and rather critical; Austrian activities are less sharply outlined, although the denunciations of Conrad and Berchtold are explicit enough. But Dr. Gooch does not exonerate Germany. If it is an argu-

able question whether Bismarck "played his game with matchless skill" (p. 154) in the Bulgarian crisis of 1885-1888, he was a man of peace. On the other hand, Bülow, Holstein, and Tirpitz are portrayed as dangerous and unscrupulous, Bethmann as weak, the Kaiser as the plaything of the militarists; in 1914 "the German Government incurred a share in the guilt of the catastrophe scarcely less than that of Austria herself" (p. 534).

The root of the evil was, no doubt, the "division of Europe into two armed camps" (p. 559); but it seems to the reviewer that there was a fundamental difference between French militarism as reflected in the *cafés chantants* and Russian militarism as expressed by the war minister's boastings, and the militarism of Germany, which was a state institution, had conquered the national mind, and was so powerful that it could push the civil authorities rudely aside. It is doubtful whether Generals Sukhomlinov and Ianushkevitch allowed the Russian general mobilization to continue after it had been countermanded by the Tsar (p. 538), for General Dobrolorsky, the officer in charge of mobilization, has affirmed that the Tsar was not disobeyed and that only partial mobilization was carried out on July 29. Dr. Gooch then adds that the World War was "precipitated by the action of Russia at a moment when conversations between Vienna and Petrograd were being resumed" (p. 547): the general mobilization was ordered late on July 30, and not till the next day did Austria signify her willingness to resume conversations. He also states that "Russian troops crossed the frontier into East Prussia before the expiration of the time-limit", i.e., before 12 noon on August 1 (p. 549), but the first report of such action reached Berlin at 4 a.m. on August 2.

There is no bibliography, but copious references indicate the enormous range of the author's reading.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

The World Crisis. By the Rt. Hon. WINSTON S. CHURCHILL, First Lord of the Admiralty 1911 to 1915. (London: Thornton Butterworth; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1923. Pp. xiii, 589. 30s.)

In a late number of this *Review* appeared a notice of a volume by the Hon. Josephus Daniels, secretary of the navy during the World War, and now appears the first volume of a work on the activities of the British navy during the same period by the Rt. Hon. Winston Spencer Churchill, first lord of the admiralty from 1911 to 1915. The two volumes have several points of similarity. Each was written by a civilian with no special previous knowledge of naval matters and a journalist by profession, though Mr. Churchill had considerable military training before entering upon his important and difficult office. Each is primarily an apology for its author's administration of his office; but, while Mr.

Daniels sees everything *coulur de rose* and avoids controversies for the most part. Mr. Churchill is at great pains to meet criticism, and even goes so far as to make charges against both officers and officials, as in the unfortunate case of Rear-Admiral Cradock, the martyr of Coronel. Each volume is written in frankly popular vein, with a view to its extensive sale; but, while Mr. Daniels confines himself to the ordinary modern journalistic style, Mr. Churchill indulges in language that is rhapsodical and dramatic to the point of extravagance, especially in a book which pretends to the dignity of a history.

It must be pointed out, however, that neither of these volumes can be accepted as history, though each, from the mere fact that its author occupied a position of the greatest power and importance, deals with the fabric of history, and is in a way a part of it. But nothing approaching a history of the World War can be written only five years after the close of that tremendous convulsion. Only contributions to its history, more or less important according to the person and the position of their authors, can be made; but the value of a book like that under discussion, influenced as it must be by personal considerations and the necessity of making it a commercial success, is thereby vitally lessened.

The layman, especially the admirer of Mr. Churchill's career, will find it a very readable book; but the professional historian, and particularly the professional sailor, will harbor a different opinion. Nobody can deny the author's high attainments or his particular achievements as first lord. He brought to his task great enthusiasm and energy and succeeded in making his country his debtor in many ways, particularly in his insistence upon the building of the famous first division of battle-ships, with their speed of twenty-five knots and their fifteen-inch guns, his timely mobilization of the fleet, and his recognition of the talents of Admiral Beatty. One of his chief personal handicaps was his over-confidence in his own capabilities, the tendency to "go it alone", which is shown in his book by the many strategical notes, such as those on pages 170 ff. One gets the distinct impression that British naval administration was a good deal a matter of personalities and that there was a regrettable lack of some such expert and authoritative body as our own General Board. The spectacle is offered of a keen-witted but too self-confident chief, getting about his only professional stimulus from a single person, in this case the Homeric and impetuous Fisher, and then going about his work with vigor, it is true, but with a lightness that approached cock-sureness, the consequences of which were more than once tragic. The escape of the *Geben*, the Gallipoli fiasco, and the Antwerp affair are examples of this lack of sound and expert advice in matters of the greatest moment, although the blame for these cannot be placed at Mr. Churchill's door alone.

He must, however, be held responsible for the tragedy of Coronel, which aroused horror and consternation in Great Britain and which resulted in the practical annihilation of a British squadron, with not a soul saved from the foundered warships. Mr. Churchill would have done

better to assume at least some of the blame for this piece of naval mismanagement, instead of endeavoring, by somewhat specious rhetoric and selected references from the official records, to place it upon the brave commander of the British squadron, against whom nothing can be said except that he might have waited a little longer for more definite orders and that he acted in the heroic spirit of the British navy. Mr. Churchill is at great pains to show that, in attacking the modern cruisers of Admiral von Spee without the fourteen-year-old *Canopus*, Admiral Cradock disobeyed orders and must therefore bear the blame for the result.

The fact is that this result came about partly through a lack of precision in the orders sent to Cradock and partly through an exaggeration, on Churchill's part, of the fighting and steaming capabilities of the *Canopus*, of which he writes (p. 449): "With the *Canopus*, Admiral Cradock's squadron was safe. The *Scharnhorst* and *Gneisenau* would never have ventured to come within range of her four 12-inch guns. . . . The old battleship, with her heavy armour and artillery, was in fact a citadel. . . ." But this was tragically far from being the case; in fact it is practically a certainty that, had the *Canopus* been with Cradock at Coronel, she would have followed the *Good Hope* and the *Monmouth* to the bottom of the Pacific with all her ship's crew. The reason for this conviction is that this "citadel" of Mr. Churchill's possessed the same armor as that of the *Good Hope*, which proved impotent against the modern 8-inch guns of von Spee, and she carried guns which were not only of an antiquated mark (only 35 calibres), but which were quite outranged by von Spee's eights. Hence, since *Scharnhorst* and *Gneisenau* steamed 22 knots to *Canopus*'s 15½, the former had but to keep out of range and sink the enemy in all comfort. That this primary truth in naval tactics was disregarded by the Admiralty is as astonishing as it is sad. Perhaps it is only another instance of the old British habit of underrating the enemy. But is there any surprise at the inability of Admiral Cradock to comprehend the orders, first, "to meet them [the German ships] in company. *Canopus* should accompany *Glasgow*, *Monmouth*, and *Otranto*, and should search and protect trade in combination", and then, "Concur in your concentration of *Canopus*, *Good Hope*, *Glasgow*, *Monmouth*, *Otranto*, for combined operation"? Cradock cabled, "in event of the enemy's heavy cruisers concentrating West Coast of South America, it is necessary to have a British force on each coast strong enough to bring them to action". Why "on each coast"? Because Cradock knew that (as he cabled on October 18) he could not follow the fast German ships if they chose to change their centre of operations, since, "owing to *Canopus*, the speed of my squadron cannot exceed 12 knots".

In suggesting this, Cradock did not mean a separation of forces, but the concentration of a sufficient force in each ocean to defeat the Germans. But the arrival of the German squadron on the Chilean coast called for immediate action. Churchill's orders to search for and destroy the enemy's cruisers, with his repeated hints that *Canopus* should be em-

ployed by Cradock, made the situation a difficult one for the latter. Therefore, since it was absurd to try to catch the German cruisers with *Canopus*, Cradock, under the conflicting instructions, chose the only course which seemed to have a chance to defeat, or at least to destroy the usefulness of, the enemy. The disaster at Coronel was due to the division by the Admiralty of the fleet in South American waters into two inferior squadrons and to the conflicting and indecisive orders to Admiral Cradock.

Mr. Churchill complains that the "official historian", Sir Julian Corbett, a very excellent authority, differs with him on the subject of Coronel, as upon many others. Perhaps the explanation is that Sir Julian was a naval expert, while Mr. Churchill was a gifted amateur. The politician may possibly agree with the late first lord; the historian must agree with Sir Julian. The task of a civilian head of the navy during a great war is an enormously difficult one. Fortunate he who, in such a position, has the talent or the good fortune to choose good advisers and the moral courage to subordinate himself to them.

EDWARD BRECK.

A History of the Great War. By JOHN BUCHAN. In four volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company; London and Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons. 1922. Pp. xxxi, 552; ix, 578; xi, 603; xi, 536. \$20.00.)

THIS is a fairly drastic revision of the work which was published serially from 1915 to 1919 in twenty-four little volumes as *Nelson's History of the War*. The work in its original form was the best of its kind; the revised form is now the best extensive treatment of the subject in English. Mr. Buchan knows a good deal about military affairs, present and past; he has had the advantages of official position and personal relationship in talking with some of the most important Allied leaders in the conflict; he has sifted a host of military documents, official and unofficial; and he has, moreover, a gift of colorful adjective and vivid phrase which lends distinction to his writing. He has aimed to narrate one of the greatest epochs in history, showing not only the changing tides of battle but the intricate political, economic, and social transformations which were involved in a strife not of armies but of peoples. He would give us an epic of England's conflict with Germany such as Froude gave us of England's struggle with Spain or Oman is giving us of England's Peninsular War with Napoleon. Almost he has succeeded. Almost he has become a great historian. But not quite.

The work would have been much better if the author had confined himself to military and naval aspects of the war. Here he is at home. Particularly is he at home on the Western Front with the French and, above all, with the British; and in such chapters as those on the battles of the Marne, of Ypres, of Neuve Chapelle, of Loos, and of the Somme, he combines real knowledge with brilliancy of style and acuteness of

criticism. Noteworthy is the judiciousness of his treatment of Kluck's movements in 1914, of the ill-starred defense of Antwerp, and also of the fateful attacks on the Dardanelles. Incidentally, his account of the reduction of the German colonies is interesting and valuable.

The work falls short of historical greatness because its non-military sections are terribly marred by the author's personal prejudices and by his failure to utilize highly important information which has become generally available since the war. He still attributes to Germany a monopoly of all those developments of extravagant nationalism, selfish and greedy imperialism, blatant militarism, and unscrupulous diplomacy which paved the way to the Great War. He still envisages the conflict as one between devils and angels. The world may have become disillusioned since 1915, but not Mr. Buchan. He is still at war, and a holy war it is. He can still write concerning the entry of British troops into Jerusalem in December, 1917, that "they would recover and make free the sacred places of the human spirit which their enemies sought to profane and enslave, and in this task they walked reverently, as on hallowed ground" (IV, 85).

Mr. Buchan is very ignorant of diplomacy before and during the war. He gives a wrong date for the Franco-Russian alliance (I, 45) and makes no mention of the secret engagements between France and Italy. He reaffirms the mythical Potsdam Conference of July 5, 1914 (I, 52-53). He admits that the issuance of secret instructions for general Russian mobilization by Sukhomlinov was "improper", but he excuses it as patriotic and reasonable (I, 60) and defends the blamelessness of Russia on the curious ground that "the aberrations of Sukhomlinov . . . were in defiance of the Tsar" (I, 79). He is silent on the secret treaties concluded during the war, and on domestic politics of foreign countries he is frequently mistaken. For example, he states that Prussia possessed a permanent majority of votes in the German Bundesrat (I, 14) and that Mr. Wilson was re-elected to the presidency in 1916 "by a great majority" (III, 355).

Mr. Buchan writes as a nationalist. As such he must defend everything that England does and almost everything that England's allies do, and for the same reason he must assail everything that Germany does and heap contempt and ridicule on everything that Germany's allies do. Germans before the war, we are told, had "immense erudition which beat ineffectual wings and achieved little that was lasting in scholarship; a meticulousness in business organization which . . . somehow did not achieve much" (I, 245). Venizelos and Ferdinand of Rumania are exalted to the skies, while Ferdinand of Bulgaria and King Constantine are stretched out in the gutter. Bulgaria is damned for selling herself to the highest bidder, and for a similar auction-room transaction Italy is eulogized. Italy "was jealous of her honour. More wise than Germany, she did not believe in a Machiavellianism which offended the sense of decency of the world" (I, 320). Edith Cavell is compared with Joan of Arc (II, 435), and Professor Werner Sombart is "not a profound

thinker or a pleasing writer" (II. 463). Britain has always fought in behalf of small nationalities, yet the nationalistic Boers "were nakedly reactionary and obscurantist" (I. 434), and Ireland "was politically immature. . . . She was at variance, not with Britain, but with civilization" (III. 31). All British generals, all British admirals, and all British conservative statesmen receive grandiloquent praise: Swinburne on Byron is quoted in praise of Kitchener (III. 54); to Jellicoe "the country owed everything" (IV. 168); Haig is ranked, next to Foch, as the greatest soldier whom the whole war produced (IV. 438); and Mr. Balfour is described as "the greatest pure intellect which our time has seen in the profession of politics" (II. 67). At the end of the war Britain finds the future of the world "largely entrusted to her reluctant hands" (IV. 436). That word "reluctant" is the final and irrefutable proof of the genuineness of Mr. Buchan's British nationalism.

Mr. Buchan writes as a Tory, so much so that in one significant respect he allows his Toryism to outweigh his nationalism. He dislikes and belittles Mr. Lloyd George. He underestimates the war achievements of the Welsh Liberal at the Exchequer, at the Ministry of Munitions, and in the premiership. By reason of his prejudice, he gives an unfair account of the protracted negotiations for the appointment of an Allied generalissimo, an account as unjustly favorable to Haig as it is unjustly unfavorable to Lloyd George. It may be his Toryism too which renders Mr. Buchan such an ignorant guide to Russian history of the period. So long as the Russians were fighting the Germans "there seemed to be in them a wide humanity, a pity for the oppressed, a mercifulness and an unworldliness like that of the Gospels" (I. 313), but the second Revolution of 1917, which led to Russia's withdrawal from the war, was "the eternal slave insurrection, the revolt of those intolerant or incapable of freedom" (IV. 149). There is no comprehension of the underlying causes of the Russian Revolution; there is no explanation of the evils of the autocracy and its bureaucracy or of the land system; there is no hint that the Allies themselves deserve some blame for the failure of Kerensky and the success of the Bolsheviks. On the other hand, we are led to suppose that Rasputin was the principal cause of the Revolution, and we are gravely told that Nicholas II. was an heroic and liberal monarch and that with his murder the rule of the Bolsheviks became a "carnival of devilry" (IV. 292-293). Edmund Burke on the French Revolution was not worse.

A work may be great by reason of what it omits to say as well as for what it says. Into the peace negotiations Mr. Buchan has not gone, and the omission enhances the value of his military history. The value of his military history would be still greater if non-military half-truths and misapprehensions were subjected to ruthless omission.

CARLTON J. H. HAYES.

The Pomp of Power. [Anonymous.] (New York: George H. Doran Company. 1922. Pp. iii, 291. \$3.00.)

Sir Douglas Haig's Command, December 19, 1915, to November 11, 1918. By GEORGE A. B. DEWAR, assisted by Lieut.-Col. J. H. BORASTON, C. B. In two volumes. (London: Constable and Company. 1922. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1923. Pp. xxxvii, 415; xviii, 375. \$10.00.)

BOTH these works, which at first glance seem to be of high importance, are rather disappointing. The author of *Sir Douglas Haig's Command* was evidently so close to the British commander-in-chief that his book might be regarded as a memoir; but unfortunately he has permitted himself to go so far on the road to adulation as to weaken the strongest claim to glory that might be made for his hero. The anonymous author of the *Pomp of Power* is obviously well informed. One might guess that he had wide acquaintanceship in the journalistic world, perhaps that he himself had been interested in newspaper publishing, and in all likelihood had also enjoyed some parliamentary experience. But the book is diverting rather than authoritative, since it is frequently impossible to distinguish the statements based upon the author's own contact with events from those derived from gossip. He ranges over a variety of topics—the character of the Franco-British understanding in the days preceding the war, French war plans, Joffre, Nivelle, unique command, various personalities such as Lloyd George, Asquith, Caillaux, Northcliffe, ending with a discursive sketch of the making of the Versailles Treaty. He is sardonically humorous, suspicious of "forward-looking" politicians, distributing judicious criticism and mild praise with a fairly even hand. To sail through the episodes mentioned above on an even keel is something of an accomplishment, and the reviewer, even when disagreeing with his conclusions, as in the chapter on the treaty, is constrained to express admiration for the author's manner, for it is that of a gentleman. None the less his book can hardly be regarded as an independent authority. It may tend to confirm an impression or raise doubts; on no single subject can it be looked upon as conclusive.

Mr. Dewar's book is a popularized narrative, based upon the *Despatches*, frankly designed to make plain "the science and foresight of our leadership on the Western Front". At times it ceases to be an *apologia* and becomes almost an apotheosis: "Many French and British leaders—soldiers and statesmen—did fine service throughout these colossal years; it would be fanciful or false to overlook the statesmen; but after a long and cool study of the evidence, one naturally reaches the conviction that the British Commander-in-Chief was the most indispensable of them all." In support of such generalizations the author adduces his own interpretation of events rather than what might be regarded strictly as evidence. Inevitably he tends to disparage factors for which Haig was not directly responsible. The criticism and intervention of British civilians, whom

he describes as "war-meddlers and muddlers", is resented; "the British Government in 1918 did not play the game"; the mistakes of the French army commanders are underlined; the Americans who pierced the Hindenburg line are saved from the disastrous effects of their faulty tactics by the Australians. "The British had borne the vast burden of defence in 1918 as they had borne the vast burden of offence in 1917; and it was well recognised by those in command on the Western Front that if the German Army was to be defeated in 1918, the British Army must be the chief weapon of accomplishment."

The first volume covers the campaigns of 1916 and 1917; much of it is descriptive, some of it contentious. The author is concerned to prove the necessity of the *guerre d'usure*, and the intimate connection of the final victory of 1918 with the wearing-out battles of the Somme and the costly British offensives of Vimy and Passchendaele. He is contemptuous of those who criticized the strategy of Robertson and Haig as a plan simply to raise and train more men, in the hope that after the two sides had gone on killing each other and all the Germans were dead there would still be a few Allies left and they would win. It was necessary, he insists, to disregard geographical objectives until the strength of the German army could be broken. When Mr. Dewar discusses the attempts to co-ordinate under Nivelle and the Supreme War Council, his tone becomes sharply contentious and his methods journalistic. Those attempts he regards as part of a disgraceful, underhand attack upon the British commander-in-chief and he refuses to utilize material which might throw light upon them: "The subject is repulsive, and the writer has not troubled to examine closely into its intrigues." For Haig's refusal to co-operate in 1917 he has only praise: "The circumspection of the British Commander-in-Chief, the cool way in which without chatter he waited and watched on this occasion, are a lesson for soldiers harassed by bad statesmanship." For the Supreme War Council the author has unmitigated contempt. He terms it "that singular body, the Versailles bureaucracy"; he is warm in his praise of Colonel Repington, to whom the nation is decidedly indebted "for his early exposures of Versailles"; he speaks of "playing at war, out-Versailles-ing Versailles". Hence it is not surprising that he commends Haig warmly for his refusal to co-operate with Foch in his plan of a general reserve, which many military critics, including General Bliss, are inclined to regard as the sole method of meeting Ludendorff's spring attack successfully. He speaks of it as the "absurd Versailles plan" and asks: "Does any person of intelligence or authority still hold seriously, that Haig ought to have stripped his front to please Versailles?"

The treatment of the battles beginning March 21, 1918, is rather confused and contradictory. In places the author admits the gravity of the defeat inflicted on British arms, attributing it to the stupidity of the home government, which by diverting men and supplies to Palestine had failed to reinforce Haig, and to the French inadequacy of support. In

Mr. Dewar's opinion it was Haig whose decision led to the appointment of Foch. More than this it was Haig, according to his account, who objected to the formula empowering Foch "to co-ordinate the operations of the Allied Armies about Amiens" and suggested that it should be enlarged to include the Western Front. In the first instance, Mr. Dewar evidently expects his readers to forget that previous to March 21 Haig had done all in his power to prevent the appointment of a generalissimo and obviously came to accept the necessity only because it was the sole remaining chance of preserving contact between the French and British. The rupture in the Allied line, for which the failure of the Haig-Pétain plan must be held responsible, and the tendency of the French to retire so as to cover Paris left the British facing the imminent possibility of being hurled into the sea. In these circumstances it is questionable how much credit should be given Haig for accepting or demanding the step which alone could save his army. In the second instance Mr. Dewar is in direct variance with Tardieu, who asserts (*Truth About the Treaty*, p. 39) that it was Foch himself and not Haig who asked Clemenceau (persistently spelled *Clémenceau* by Mr. Dewar) to enlarge his sphere of authority.

In the final chapters of the second volume, dealing with the victorious Allied offensive, the author is still more obviously concerned that the British commander-in-chief should not be deprived of the credit which is due him. He speaks of the "myth that when, in the summer of 1918, the British troops advanced triumphantly they did so because at length they were directed by consummate skill or genius—and that this skill or genius did not emanate from our own Higher Command and Army leaders, but from Marshal Foch. . . . Some people *on now learning the facts of 1918* will be tempted to describe it as the greatest lie in the war. . . ." On the contrary, the author insists, it was Haig who on two occasions saved Foch from decisions the consequences of which would have been serious, when the latter was "pressing for a clumsy and wholly unscientific operation". In all this, however, Mr. Dewar gives us nothing in the way of evidence.

Confidence in the author's candor or knowledge is further shaken by his presentation of the circumstances in which the armistice terms were drafted. It is true, as he states, that the military terms "were resolved on and approved by British, French and Americans", but it is by no means exactly true that "the Allied leaders in the field were well agreed that there should be an armistice", for General Pershing at the end of October wrote to the Supreme Council protesting against it. Nor does Mr. Dewar make plain that Field-Marshal Haig was in favor of permitting the Germans to evacuate France and Belgium with practically complete equipment, so convinced was he that they were still a dangerous fighting force and would refuse to accept the terms proposed by Foch. In this respect both Recouly (whom Mr. Dewar contradicts) and the author of *The Pomp of Power* are nearer the truth.

The Partition and Colonization of Africa. By Sir CHARLES LUCAS, K.C.B., K.C.M.G. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1922. Pp. 228. 12s. 6d.)

SIR CHARLES LUCAS has done more than most people in England to make known to his countrymen something of their great colonial heritage. His long experience as a trusted official in the Colonial Office made him familiar with the practical problems which arise from the relations between the mother-country and the dominions and at the same time has not, as is the case with some officials, obscured to him the fact that the best possible official system is useless unless the people of the country, who are ultimately responsible, realize their duties and responsibilities. He has, too, wisely seen that the best way of enlightening the public is not merely to discuss special problems as they arise, but to prepare the ground by providing a good basis of sound historical knowledge. His *Historical Geography of the British Empire*, for example, with its combination of historical and geographical information, is an almost indispensable handbook for those who wish to understand imperial problems. The book now before us on the partition and colonization of Africa is naturally of a more sketchy nature than the *Geography*, for it is a reprint of a course of lectures given to teachers not so much for the purpose of supplying information as to stimulate interest in the subject and suggest lines of study to be followed up. Although they are preliminary to the main theme of the book, the first four chapters, which deal with the geographical conditions of Africa and its history from the earliest times to 1884, when the scramble for Africa began, are perhaps the most valuable. For they give in compact and yet in most suggestive form the reasons which account for the subsequent history of Africa in relation to the European powers during the last forty years, during which that continent has become of real importance in European politics. The remaining chapters give a more detailed account of the various delimitations of frontiers, which have resulted in Africa being mapped out in its entirety among some six or seven European powers, and sketches of the characteristics of the different colonies, of the course of the late war in Africa, and of the result of the war on the map of Africa. But though this latter part is more detailed, it is not so clear as the preliminary matter, no doubt because Sir Charles attempts to be too exhaustive in too small a space. The result is sometimes rather confusing, and for his purpose of stimulating interest and provoking further reading it would have been better had he contented himself with laying down the broader lines of his thesis and leaving his audience to fill up the rest for themselves. For example, he discusses the question more than once whether European intrusions were justified. This is of course a question worth consideration, but the arguments *pro* and *con* are fairly obvious and seem hardly worth dwelling on at such length as on pages 146-149. Again, in a volume of this size dealing with the whole of a continent, the rather perfunctory and

semi-official defense of a tax on palm-kernels exported from West Africa is decidedly out of place. On the other hand, the statement of the comparative merits of the French and British systems of colonial administration is well worth giving to an English audience, which is apt to overlook the peculiar advantages in certain respects of systems different from their own. Again, Sir Charles does well to dwell on the danger that lurks in the administration of so vast a territory by the comparatively small number of European powers that have retained a substantial footing in South Africa since the war—danger owing to the lack of sufficient criticism. Finally, some useful appendixes give brief but sufficient accounts of the "tenures of the empire" and the meaning of "protectorates", "mandates", etc.

BASIL WILLIAMS.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and of the Early Republic. By FISKE KIMBALL. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1922. Pp. xx, 314. \$12.00.)

THIS book, which grew out of several lectures at the Metropolitan Museum, is a considerable addition to the literature of our early architecture. It is divided into three parts: the Seventeenth Century, the Eighteenth Century, and the Early Republic. There is a list of about two hundred houses for which nearly or quite exact dates are claimed, a collection of notes on individual houses, and an index. The book is unfortunate in its form, with too wide a page and a line so long as to be hard to read, but it is well illustrated and its great merit is that it emphasizes, though not always consistently, the value of documentary evidence and of accurate dating.

The seventeenth century does not get the detailed and careful treatment its great importance deserves. Professor Kimball adds little to our knowledge of it. Indeed his criticism is destructive rather than constructive, a fact due to his too close adherence to documents to the exclusion of the houses themselves. Then, too, his documentary information is often at second hand and, when traced to its source, sometimes becomes mere statement by men quite respectable as antiquaries but of small weight as architects or archaeologists.

The eighteenth century is somewhat better treated. The plan, the exterior, the panelling, the stair, the mantel, the floor, the ceiling, the painting are marshalled before us, and the discussion is in general good, though marred by the appearance, at least, of haste and of insufficient observation. It is curious how little one gets from it until a second or a third reading.

The greatest stress is laid upon the Republican period, the later houses generally classed as colonial—Professor Kimball prefers to call them

post-colonial—and those of what is commonly called the Greek Revival. This period is the best handled of any in the book. There is less division of opinion as to dates, less doubt as to when forms came into use and when they dropped out, and there are individual architects to whom work can be referred and whose drawings are extant. In fact, it is the day of the written document. The post-colonial, as Professor Kimball calls the type which was carried over the Revolution and more or less slowly modified, might better have had a chapter to itself, for the Greek Revival, with its temple type and its rotunda, does not really assume in the discussion the place which Professor Kimball claims for it in the history of art.

The chronological chart, or list of dated houses, and the notes on individual houses, which support it by giving the reasons for the dating or for the original form, are extremely valuable and important, even if some dates are still lacking in proof or are reached by processes which Professor Kimball elsewhere condemns.

The book is a step forward and not the last word in the history of our colonial architecture. The author has tried to compress too much into a few years of study. He has thought to settle by documents the many questions of our early art, forgetting that the houses themselves are evidence which the historian must laboriously learn to read, that he must perforce study these houses as old furniture and old silver are studied.

The reader who will profit most by the book is the historical student who, working along the same lines of documentary research, will be glad of the use to which Professor Kimball has put the written evidence in his effort to clear up the dates in our early work.

NORMAN M. ISHAM.

The Colonial Policy of William III. in America and the West Indies.

By G. H. GUTTRIDGE. [Prince Consort Prize Essay, 1922.]
(Cambridge: University Press. 1922. Pp. viii, 189. 10s.)

MR. GUTTRIDGE's essay on the colonial policy of William III. is noteworthy rather for the good intentions that prompted its author to write it than for any particular merit it possesses as an original contribution to the history of the British colonies in America. The desire of the writer to throw light on a phase of our colonial period that has been neglected in the past, even by our own students, is deserving of all praise, and his energy and enthusiasm in working a path through such a tangled maze of documents as are contained in the last ten volumes of the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, are heartily to be commended; but, in my judgment, he has unfortunately gone about the business in the wrong way.

William III. had no colonial policy, and nothing that Mr. Guttridge says in his essay gives warrant for the title that he has selected. It is

doubtful, too, whether during the years from 1689 to 1702 there existed any particular policy that is capable of being thus segregated and examined separately by itself. The Lords of Trade had a policy, clearly and definitely formulated, as early as 1680, and the Board of Trade, following after, inherited this policy, which grew of course out of the requirements of trade and the Navigation Acts. This policy was not royal either in origin or form; it was shaped long before William came to the throne, and persisted long after he was dead, and with it the king had very little to do, except so far as he was able, by virtue of his prerogative, to make or mar it. What this policy was, which had little or no support from either king or Parliament, will not be easily ascertained from this book, for Mr. Guttridge does not at any point go very far below the surface. He follows in the main a geographical and chronological order of events, pursuing his way from colony to colony and from detail to detail, presenting all things great and small in about the same proportion and nowhere indicating in any satisfactory fashion what the narrative is all about. I doubt if a reader will rise from a perusal of the book with any clear idea as to the meaning and significance of England's constitutional development and colonial relations during this important period.

On the other hand, many of the minor situations are discussed with considerable shrewdness and skill. If at times the writer seems to derive his knowledge too exclusively from one set of books and in his comments on colonial affairs reaches conclusions that are in some cases open to debate and in others are distinctly wrong, it must be remembered that no one can accurately gauge the colonial situation, who has never been in America, breathed its atmosphere, and worked among its documents. We learned long ago from a study of the prefaces to the *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial*, that it was easier for an American scholar to understand the old British colonial policy and purpose than it was for an Englishman to measure correctly the temper and spirit of the colonists, particularly those of the eighteenth century, a fact that is illustrated in a small way by the difficulty Mr. Guttridge has, in common with other Englishmen, in spelling correctly colonial names. He did not have to write "Flypse", "Courtlandt", and "Senectady", for a very little painstaking would have shown him that these were not the correct forms, just as a little more painstaking would have led him to produce a much better and more accurate bibliography. What are "near London archives"; and why is Miss Davenport made partly responsible for something that would have been much more worthily performed had she had a share in it? Why is "Richman" spelled "Rickman"? Why are the *Andros Tracts*, most of the printed colonial records, and many other important items left out, when the titles of some quite inferior books are inserted? And why are all dates, places of publication, editions, and other identifying features conspicuous by their absence?

Oddly enough, it is the failure to see the big things and the want of care with the little things that irritates one in reading this book. As

with the phrase used by Mr. Guttridge on page 18, "He centres all round the Navigation System", so in many other respects, one wishes that the writer had reached a higher level of craftsmanship in what he has attempted to do. I make this criticism the more freely because I believe that Mr. Guttridge is capable of producing a much better piece of historical work.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

The Nineteenth of April, 1775; Exhibiting a Fair and Impartial Account of the Engagement fought on that Day . . . with Candid Remarks upon certain Relations of that Sanguinary Event as set forth by other Hands. By HAROLD MURDOCK. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1923. Pp. x, 134. Plates. \$7.50.)

THREE papers read by Mr. Murdock before various historical societies in Boston and the neighborhood, and dealing respectively with the subjects "Historic Doubts on the Battle at Lexington", "The British at Concord", and "Earl Percy's Retreat to Charlestown", are published with elaborate documentation in this volume. As an example of the printer's art the book is a joy, with its large pages of clear type on expensive paper and its dozen copper-plate reproductions of old prints and original paintings. As a corrective of some overenthusiastic local accounts of what happened on that hot, historic day of April 19, 1775, accounts which, according to Mr. Murdock, were corroborated and fixed as "history" by the semi-centennial celebration of 1825, it is useful. But it seems to us that the author, in his desire to present an "impartial" version of the day's events, has rather erred on the other side. His book betrays a tendency throughout to belittle the testimony of the colonials, even when eye-witnesses, and to credit the reports of the British officers and soldiers—though why a private letter of a member of Lord Percy's brigade to family or friends at home should be so much more reliable testimony than the deposition of a member of Captain Parker's company is hard to see.

Mr. Murdock sees a proof of the growth of the legend of a brave resistance to the king's troops on Lexington common in the evolution of the pictorial representations of the "battle". The earlier prints of Doolittle and Pendleton portray "a massacre of unresisting men". The British are firing in two perfectly aligned platoons, while the Minutemen are fleeing in all directions. In later pictures a few colonials resist, then more, until finally, in Sandham's painting of 1866, which hangs in the town hall of Lexington, we find a united group of Minutemen, firm and defiant, returning the fire of the Redcoats—"too few to resist, too brave to fly". The massacre and the battle, according to Mr. Murdock, are both legendary. Pitcairn "was due in Concord within the next two hours". He was a humane man. When he saw the little group of colonials, armed with muskets, on Lexington common, all that he wanted

was to surround and disarm them. Then, no one can say just how, shooting began, and, before Pitcairn could stop it and get his troops on to the Concord road, seven or eight of the Minutemen had been killed. Mr. Murdock discusses at length the alleged atrocities of Percy's soldiers on their march back to Boston and absolves their commander from the charge of "instigating or abetting a system of savagery on his retreat". Some looting and burning of houses which furnished shelter for snipers undoubtedly occurred, but there was no cruelty. The king's officers, "from their commander down, conducted the retreat in the spirit of gentlemen, and not of brutes".

In brief, Mr. Murdock's account of the day is an apology for the British soldier, who, while properly on the king's business, "was marched and driven to the last ounce of his strength, and believed that he had been made the victim of sneaking, scalping assassins who were afraid to show their faces". We appreciate fully the fact that the author is heeding the counsel, "*audiatur et altera pars*"; but the better counsel, after all, is, *audiatur utraque pars*.

DAVID SAVILLE MUZZEY,

Letters of Members of the Continental Congress. Edited by EDMUND C. BURNETT. Volume II., July 5, 1776, to December 31, 1777. (Washington, D. C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1923. Pp. lxxiii, 638. Paper, \$5.00; cloth, \$5.50.)

THE second volume of the *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress* is fully equal to the first, which is to say that it is unsurpassed by any work of editing with which the reviewer is acquainted. One who undertakes research in the letters finds every need amply supplied. There is a careful table of contents, a most useful list of members with every day of attendance accounted for, and an index which satisfies every test. There has been no haste in preparing these volumes. They have been done as if nothing in the world were more worth while, and no pains too great to make them perfect. The preface of some twenty pages is very valuable and contains some real contributions to the history of the American Revolution. It is also a good summary of the main activities of the Congress during the period covered by the letters of this volume—from July 5, 1776, to December 31, 1777. There are some interesting facts, too, about the character of the published letters. One-third of the letters dated July 5 to December 31, 1776, are not found elsewhere in print, while more than half of the letters bearing dates in 1777 are now printed for the first time. A series of fifty letters by Joseph Trumbull not hitherto in print throw much light on the difficulties of supplying the army in the early days of the war. Some new Notes of Debates kept by Secretary Thomson throw new light on a proposed expedition against West Florida and an effort to replace Schuyler by Gates. New, also, are some notes by Benjamin Rush and an abstract of debates by Thomas

Burke, and these throw light on a conference as to the regulation of prices and a debate as to the interest on loan-office certificates. Letters of Henry Laurens, not included in Wallace's *Life of Laurens*, appear for the first time. These, with new letters from or to Hancock, Schuyler, and Bartlett, constitute the most notable new materials.

The editor points out that the period of eighteen months covered by the letters in this volume deals with events concerned for the most part with failure and defeat. Twice Congress fled from Philadelphia, and a halter figured in the dreams of more than one member. Congress, fearful of a standing army, was long in learning the lesson of "preparedness", but even it was a more apt pupil than the state legislatures. The letters of this period show Washington begging of Congress, Congress begging the state legislatures, and them pleading with their constituents to forget the bogey of military power. Another subject upon which there is much new light in this volume is that of army supply. The story of the almost complete breakdown of the commissary and quartermaster departments is best told in these letters. This was in part due to futile effort of Congress to keep in its own hands both executive and legislative powers. Not even committees were fully trusted, and forty men muddled what one man of decent capacities could have done well. For months Congress dallied with plans for executive departments, and the petty fears which prevented the accomplishment are all displayed in the letters contained in this volume.

Another great problem now given a new exegesis in these letters is that of finances. Congress was possessed of the same reeling delusion as that which in our day has possessed Russia, Austria, and Germany. Only the printing press seemed equal to the task of paying their debts, feeding the insatiable maw of war. All the phases of that vital problem are debated from every point of view in the letters here assembled. Parallel with this discussion ran that concerning the nature of Articles of Confederation. It is here revealed that Edward Rutledge proposed to take this disturbing question out of Congress and to have a special convention undertake the task. Though that was soon to become the accepted mode of constitution-making in America, it was not in this matter seriously entertained, for the idea was a new one and not easy to drum into the minds of Congressmen. Important as Confederation was, the letters show that for a period of more than six months the matter slept in Congress altogether. Dr. Burnett's study of attendance in his List of Members shows that poor or changing attendance greatly retarded the solution of any great problem. John Adams wrote in February, 1777, of "Congress continually changing, until very few Faces remain, that I saw in the first Congress. Not one from South Carolina, not one from North Carolina, only one from Virginia, only two from Maryland. . . . The rest are dead, resigned, deserted or cutt up into Governors, etc. at home." It is in this vivid style that we have presented to us in these

letters as nowhere else the story of the trials, failures, and occasional triumphs of the Continental Congress.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

A History of Agriculture in Wisconsin. By JOSEPH SCHAFER. [Wisconsin Domesday Book, General Studies, vol. I.] (Madison: State Historical Society of Wisconsin. 1922. Pp. xiii, 212. \$2.00, not including postage.)

THIS admirable monograph was written as a base for the series of Town Studies which the Wisconsin Historical Society is preparing under the title of the *Wisconsin Domesday Book*. It is, as the author insists, a tentative sketch. It opens with a well-written survey of the geology, soil, and forest conditions of the state. Three splendid chapters follow, much the best part of the book, on the period of pioneering. Less opportunity for original treatment was offered in the eras of wheat specialization and the escape therefrom to diversified farming, for these fields the author found pre-empted. But he strikes out again into new soil when he takes up the movement of agriculture from the prairies into the forest and cut-over lands of northern Wisconsin, and the resulting relations of lumbering to farming. The rise of the dairy industry to a position of pre-eminence comprises an interesting chapter which really concludes the volume as a study in the development of Wisconsin agriculture. But the author has added a chapter on rural life, some of it reminiscent, which, though sketchy and interfering a little with the organic unity of the volume, is so charming that the reader will not complain of it. The book is well balanced, though the chapter on Improved Livestock seems a little overloaded with details of prize horses and individual breeders, especially in view of the absence of discussion of such important subjects as tobacco and sugar-beet growing.

Dr. Schafer possesses the secret of writing local history that has a wider than local significance. That is particularly true of those fine early chapters in which, with minute Town Studies data at his command, he demonstrates for selected areas what kind of land pioneers sought out, the ideal combination of "timber, prairie or opening, and marsh", why poorer foreign immigrants went into the wooded lake-shore counties, what was the influence of markets and of possible future lines of communication on pre-emption, what part speculators played who bought mill and town sites, in short, how the process of pioneering worked itself out. These fruits of a small part of the Town Studies promise well for the enterprise as a whole. There is the same broad vision in the discussion of pioneer origins. The author is not content to tell merely the old story of immigrant contributions to the state's history, but traces them back to their origin, explains why pioneers left home, and by what routes, and with what equipment. Particularly suggestive is the account of conditions which stimulated migration from Vermont and New York, the cradle of Wisconsin's early society.

Wisconsin's agricultural history is largely the familiar story of transition from wheat specialization to diversified farming or dairying. Reformers naturally felt that the change came too slowly, and this they ascribed to inertia, ignorance, and shiftlessness. Such doctrine is somewhat reflected in these pages, and there is truth in it. But not the whole truth. Diversified farming requires capital and abundant labor, both scarce in new communities. Lacking them, Wisconsin farmers could have undertaken diversified farming only by mercilessly driving themselves and their women and children. Foreign-born immigrants were willing to do that, but happily native Americans less so. They exhausted their soil rather than brutalize themselves and their families, and, when theorists urged growing living fences of hedge (p. 108) or producing root crops for feed (in 1852, p. 105), they ignored them as impractical idealists. Only after fields had been cleared and debts paid, and adequate shelters built, and soil exhausted, was the change to rational agriculture possible. Then, it is true, inertia still often stood in the way of progress. Again, the western pioneer was a speculator as well as a farmer. He bought more land than he could properly till in the hope of a rise in value. Who will criticize him for that? But it certainly also retarded the advent of diversified farming.

The volume is in the usual good form of the society's publications, it is well illustrated and indexed, and contains in an appendix an interesting census of old homesteads.

FREDERICK MERK.

Life of Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore. By ALLEN SINCLAIR WILL, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D. In two volumes. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1922. Pp. xvii, 584; xiii, 585-1145. \$10.00.)

THE author of this life of Cardinal Gibbons was chosen by the latter as his biographer in 1909. The cardinal was then seventy-five years of age. During the five years following that authorization, the biographer enjoyed the advantage of countless conversations with the cardinal, during the course of which all of the bearings of the task, its difficulties, and proportions were under discussion. The author had access to the archives of the archdiocese of Baltimore, and the cardinal gave to him a private journal which he had kept since 1868. Dr. Will published a preliminary biography in one volume in 1911. The present work replaces that one and indicates the completion of the task.

This biography of Cardinal Gibbons is most satisfactory as an authoritative and intimate account of the life of a man who possessed the gift of universal appeal and attained to a degree of extraordinary distinction in American and Catholic life. The story is very well told. The author dominates his material throughout, keeps his subject in the foreground, and completely effaces himself. He has given us an excellent

narrative biography without attempting the critical evaluation of the cardinal's place in American Catholic life. This latter task must be reserved to a future date when time will have settled the proportion of things and further sources of information will be brought to light.

The difficulties that lie before a biographer of Cardinal Gibbons are not slight. His personality almost defied analysis. The reviewer, who admired Cardinal Gibbons profoundly, has made countless attempts when among His Eminence's friends to invite comment on the sources of his curious and unmistakable power. Everyone knew that he did possess the gift of universal appeal. Many attempted to account for it. But the analytical method of describing personality leads always to results that are far short of the impressions that personality makes. Dr. Will gives us two interesting chapters in his second volume: one on the Elements of Greatness in the Cardinal and the other on his Gifts as a Leader. The description is drawn to life and done as well perhaps as it can be done.

A second difficulty for the cardinal's biographer is found in the complex processes that went on within the Catholic Church during the long years of the cardinal's leadership. He was undoubtedly an open-minded conservative. Throughout controversies that are described by the author in this field, we find a continuity of purpose and quiet determination that were among the cardinal's outstanding gifts. In the field of American civil life the cardinal is equally interesting. Interests, memories, and associations allied him with the South. Yet he was the stoutest defender of the Constitution that the country had. He was a conservative leader in a conservative church at a time when radicalism awakened much fear and industrial complications clouded thinking and interfered with progress. Nevertheless the cardinal stood forth with prompt sympathy and fine understanding of human rights involved in the labor question, and he became an aggressive servant of social justice. During the War with Spain and again in the World War, the stout loyalty of the cardinal to the institutions of the country was most inspiring.

To evaluate the personality of the cardinal, to analyze and describe his Catholic and American relations, and to marshal all of the information into a smooth running narrative which conveys a most definite picture, is an accomplishment in biographical writing. It is more marked in the present case since Dr. Will is not of the Catholic faith. This life will remain for an indefinite period the starting-point and the test of future studies of the cardinal.

When intensive studies in the history of the American Catholic Church covering the period of the cardinal's life will have been made, and when the controversies and the processes of adjustment within and without the Church will have engaged adequate attention, we shall undoubtedly gain many new documents and a wider insight into the period, all of which will play a rôle in determining the historical place of the cardinal. It is hardly probable that any later studies will reduce his stature.

Although the author tells us in the preface that the cardinal repeated to him the words of Cromwell, "Paint me as I am, warts and all", no marked success was achieved in finding or describing the blemishes hinted at. The reviewer does not lament this. He has found in this work of eleven hundred pages a compact, well-proportioned, authoritative story of an extraordinary man. It is just the kind of a life that the universal love of the cardinal demanded. The more critical processes reserved to later days will scarcely alter the estimate that the world placed spontaneously on him when he died. This biography will do much to vindicate and sustain that verdict.

MINOR NOTICES

The Story of Mankind. By Hendrik Willem Van Loon. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1923, pp. xiv, 492, \$2.20.) To stimulate an interest in the reading of history seems to be the ultimate purpose of the book. The arrangement of material and the style of its presentation, the author's original drawings freely distributed through the text, and the supplementary "historical reading list" and "questions and exercises" are all designed to that end. While the book does give a thoughtful outline of man's progress toward religious, political, and intellectual freedom and emphasizes the continuity and unity of history, it cannot stand as a contribution to new historical truth. Its chief claim to distinction lies rather in the arrangement and method of presentation of old material.

The author's style is refreshingly original. Unhampered by conventional methods of presenting historical facts, he aims to strike the imagination of his boy and girl readers. The author understands the value of visualization as an aid in stimulating interest in historical reading. He draws word-pictures effectively and his pen-drawings are for the most part helpful and suggestive. At times, in his aim to make both realistic, he overshoots the mark and leaves the impression that the child's imagination might be over-stimulated.

The comparative simplicity of the history of the ancient and early medieval periods lends itself readily to the author's style and purpose. The selection of essentials in the ancient and medieval periods is not very difficult and is in this work well done. But in the complexities of the later medieval and modern periods the reader is often left with a feeling of the inadequacy of the text. If the necessity for abbreviated treatment were not so pressing, the text, it is probable, would often draw a more complete and therefore a more truly historical picture. No book which attempts to cover the sweep of all history in one small volume can well escape this criticism.

Whether this work would lend itself readily to use as a text-book of modern history for class instruction is doubtful. Its condensation and its sketchy treatment of many historical characters and movements would lead to some confusion in the minds of pupils. But as a reference book for topical reading, it should prove of considerable value because of its stimulating character.

The closing section—a New World—is inconclusive and its content of thought might well have been put into a few paragraphs.

ROBERT A. MAURER.

Les Souterrains-Refuges de la France: Contribution à l'Histoire de l'Habitation Humaine. Par Adrien Blanchet, Membre de l'Institut. (Paris, Auguste Picard, 1923, pp. iv, 342, plates.) Blanchet has produced a work which in every sense of the word is a real contribution to the history of human habitation. Many have been the excursions into this fascinating field, some even of considerable length, but no other has been so comprehensive as Blanchet's.

The underground habit was contracted in the palaeolithic period, when man began to make use of natural caves, and it has persisted down to the present day. The underground refuges which come within the scope of the present work are all post-palaeolithic: in part prehistoric and in part historic. The oldest date from the neolithic period, the youngest from the Middle Ages and even later. They have been found in France alone to the number of at least a thousand; and the author makes reference to many in other European countries. A study of the sixteen plates, giving ground plans and sections (both cross and longitudinal), suffices to impress one with the extreme variability of plan in these subterranean havens.

A chapter is devoted to the general characters and contents, including dimensions, ceiling, supports, ventilation, water-supply, lighting, seats, hearths, doors, interior defenses, traps, arms, tools, utensils, etc. The pottery for the most part is coarse (with grains of quartz and mica in the paste), unpainted, and made by hand; but pottery of the Roman and later epochs is also met with. The use of underground refuges as places of human burial is of comparatively rare occurrence, proving that this was not the primary object for which they were constructed; the introduction of domestic animals into them is noted as taking place, but at a rather late date.

The author is persuaded that many of the subterranean refuges, especially the oldest ones, are contemporaneous with the neolithic pile villages of France—for example, those in Lake Chalain and at Clairvaux (Jura). He likewise agrees with Baron de Baye in believing that the well-known artificial caves of the Petit-Morin valley (Marne) served as places of sepulture during the latter part of the neolithic period, but that most of them had at an earlier date functioned as places of habitation and refuge.

There is a frequent association of underground refuges with megalithic monuments and with Roman roads. Many of the important cities of France are built over systems of subterranean refuges, some of which are obviously very old. Among the cities mentioned as belonging to this class are: Arras, Beauvais, Bourges, Cambrai, Chartres, Clermont-Ferrand, Compiègne, Laon, Limoges, Orleans, Paris, Périgueux, and Poitiers.

Broadly speaking, one may divide underground refuges into two classes: (1) those specially created for the purpose; and (2) those which existed first as quarries and which later were so altered as to serve as places of refuge. Paris affords a good example of the second class.

In richness of quotation from ancient and modern authors and in bibliographic notes, the volume leaves nothing to be desired. Other useful features are the long inventory of underground refuges arranged by departments and the fourteen pages of index.

GEORGE GRANT MACCURDY.

Des Clans aux Empires: l'Organisation Sociale chez les Primitifs et dans l'Orient Ancien. Par A. Moret, Professeur à l'Université de Paris, Conservateur du Musée Guimet, et G. Davy, Doyen de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Dijon. [*L'Évolution de l'Humanité*, dirigée par Henri Berr, VI.] (Paris, La Renaissance du Livre, 1923, pp. xxviii, 430, 15 fr.) The student of ancient history is continually beset by problems of origin. Whether his special field is Egyptian, Babylonian, Old Testament, Greek, or Roman history, he finds his sources changing, sometimes gradually, more often at a stroke, from the historical to the legendary and mythical. The first impulse of the modern historian was to attempt to cut a sharp line between the historical and the non-historical, to use the former and reject the latter. But he soon recognized the value of non-historical sources. As the excavations in Egypt and Babylonia put into our hands records which pushed back the beginnings of ancient history by leaps and bounds, and gave a prominent place in that history to more than one hitherto legendary character, it was thought possible to discover by rational processes the historical facts lying behind the legends of a people. This is the position held by many of the "higher critical school" in Germany to-day. The older critical scholars, like W. Robertson Smith and Wellhausen, looked to the tribal life of Arabia for hints as to the development of early Israelite history. Ethnology was called to the aid of history. Finally, with the recent rapid development of the study of prehistoric Europe, it became obvious that the ancient historian would find a knowledge of European archaeology of value in interpreting the earliest—also stone-age—remains of Egypt, Babylonia, and Syria.

In a new volume in the series on *L'Évolution de l'Humanité*, edited by Henri Berr, an attempt is made to trace the path which human society may have taken in its progress from the "clan" to the state or "empire". Moret, the ancient historian, is well aware that neither in Egypt nor in Babylonia do our earliest records take us back into a society where the clan or tribe is the unit. But he feels that much of the structure of society in earliest Egypt, especially the position of the Pharaoh, can only be explained on the assumption of a prehistoric tribal organization. So he has called to his aid the ethnologist Davy. The first part of the volume (by Davy) is taken up largely by a description of the tribal society

of Australian bushmen and North American Indians. Possible parallels in the development of the tribal society of prehistoric Egypt and Babylonia are pointed out. Might it not have been well to give more attention to "primitive" life as it still exists in Arabia, as was done by Robertson Smith and Wellhausen? Few scholars will find fault, except in matters of minute detail, with Moret's carefully planned and skillfully wrought sketch of the development of political organization in the ancient Near East, which forms the larger part of this readable volume.

D. D. LUCKENBILL.

Werden und Vergehen von Staaten, gruppiert um die Methode, die Territorialentwicklung in Kurven zu veranschaulichen. Von Georg Glockemeier, Dipl. Bergingenieur. (Berlin, Otto Elsner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1923, pp. vi, 174, maps.) One of the intellectual effects upon Germany of the Great War has been the stimulation of a tendency to apply mathematical modes of reasoning to the processes of history. The work best illustrative of it perhaps is the huge treatise by Oswald Spengler on *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*, the pessimistic spirit of which suits the prevailing state of mind. Herr Glockemeier's little book, on the other hand, free from prepossessions of the sort, attempts to explain the rise and fall of states on the basis of their territorial enlargement and shrinkage. Assuming that the landed area held by a country at any given time is indicative of its strength and importance, the author has prepared a series of charts upon which he has plotted the curves of increase and decrease, inserting the respective dates and events in connection with which the changes occur. Though centring attention mainly upon Europe, he has cited examples also from Asia and America.

Had Herr Glockemeier confined his efforts wholly to the composition of the charts and elaborated them so as to include all of the chief alterations, external and internal, in territorial extent, the results of his labors would have been more serviceable to the student of history. His text itself has little value. It furnishes a number of political sketches derived from standard works, mainly in German, and from the larger atlases. Errors and misinterpretations are inevitable when surveys of the kind are undertaken by persons who lack the training requisite to set forth the course of history. The political factor, moreover, is not the sole touchstone by which to measure the significance of events. Nor can the mere amount of territory possessed by a state at any particular time be regarded properly as the evidence of its actual power and prestige.

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

Olympic Victor Monuments and Greek Athletic Art. By Walter Woodburn Hyde. (Washington, Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1921, pp. xix, 406, paper, \$10.00; cloth, \$11.00.) In the history of Greek civilization one of the still unfinished chapters is Greek sculpture. With

the mocking grin of a Tenean "Apollo" or the far-away gaze of an Apoxyomenos, Greek statues, especially athletic statues, persistently defy identification. We grow weary of reading their uniform and uniniforming labels in our museums: "Greek Athlete of the Fifth Century B.C., after Polykleitos", or "Greek Athlete of the Fourth Century B.C., after Lysippos". School types not individuals! And even this broad, impersonal classification rests on shaky foundations; the discovery of an Agias dynamites the elaborate structure of an entire school. Occasionally the genius of a Furtwaengler flashes forth to restore to us the Lemnian Athena of Phidias. There seems little doubt that we have recovered copies of Myron's Diskobolos and of Polykleitos's Canon. But where one identification is accepted by the majority of archaeologists a hundred are proposed only to be rejected. The highly controversial literature of the subject has become enormous. We welcome any compilation and summary such as Professor Hyde has made for the single genre of statues of victors at Olympia in both the athletic and the musical contests, especially when it is so handsomely printed and so profusely illustrated.

The author states his aim to be the reconstruction of the types and poses of the statues of Olympic victors. What appears to be a limitation to a special field within the athletic genre in fact is no real limitation at all. The types and poses of Olympic victors can be determined only by a study of the whole field of athletic sculpture. Thus Professor Hyde's conclusions are no different from those found in E. N. Gardiner's handbook, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*. Professor Hyde's real contribution is rather his full and judicious presentation of the evidence on which those conclusions rest. Unfortunately for the reader, he has not followed Gardiner's model in presenting this material first historically, and then topically. He has not seen his subject in proper perspective; he has concentrated his attention unevenly upon successive topics and has tried to adapt them to an inappropriate classification, which he has taken over from Furtwaengler-Urlichs's *Greek and Roman Sculpture*. But the book will prove very valuable as a work of reference, encyclopaedic in scope. Happily it is provided with the two essentials of a source-book—an excellent index and abundant references. It will undoubtedly form a base of operations for many an archaeologist in the future who may be enticed into this fascinating field of artistic and historical research.

KENDALL K. SMITH.

The Evolution of Hungary and its Place in European History. By Count Paul Teleki, former Prime Minister of Hungary, Professor of Geography in the Faculty of Economics at the University of Budapest. [The Institute of Politics Publications, Williams College.] (New York, Macmillan Company, 1923, pp. xxiii, 312, \$3.50, map.) This volume consists of eight popular lectures delivered before the Institute of Politics in July and August, 1921. Two lectures are devoted to each of the four

aspects: geographic, historical, economic, and racial. Novel maps and charts and an excellent bibliography accompany the text.

Count Teleki is a distinguished geographer, who appears in these pages as a Magyar, national in spirit, moderate in statement, and scientific in method. At bottom, the work is a treatise mainly on geographic influences in the history and contemporary problems of Hungary by one who is an ardent disciple of regional geography and who is convinced that it will help Hungary's cause to give an exposition of "those great basic facts and conditions which dominate life, and which are always no less powerful than the human will, indeed, in the long run, even more powerful".

From this point of view he analyzes the problem of nationality of Hungary and finds the scientific solution neither in the centralizing nationalistic idea of the old Magyar aristocracy nor in the simple transfer by the Peace Conference to other sovereignties of territories along essentially ethnic lines. He looks for a solution in the modernization and democratization of the old medieval Transylvanian constitution under Magyar control.

The chapters on economic development are suggestive and throw new light on Magyar economic development before the war and on the plight of "maimed" Hungary after it. Most scholars will agree with the author that the common economic life of Hungary was a greater Magyarizer than the schools.

Equally eminent geographers and scientists from the "so-called" Succession States will hardly agree with Count Teleki in some of his conclusions and regional interpretations. Their answers may be expected, of course, in due time. Perhaps too little room has been given to man-made geography, the possible influence in the future of recent inventions, newer modes of transportation and communication. Many students will not agree with Count Teleki that Czechs and Slovaks and Croats and Serbs are each separate and absolutely distinct nationalities in spite of their disagreements. Nor will the settling of boundaries in Central Europe by the Peace Conference be attributed wholly to lack of knowledge. And, finally, many readers will pause to reflect as Hungary's popular enthusiasm to enter the World War—in spite of hatred of Austria—is ascribed to chivalry, to the "feeling of indignation at the killing of a woman" (p. 132).

ROBERT J. KERNER.

Englische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. Von Dr. Felix Salomon, Professor für Englische und Französische Geschichte an der Universität Leipzig. (Leipzig, Verlag von K. F. Koehler, 1923, pp. viii, 342.) The author of this interesting and scholarly survey of English history, from earliest times to the present, belongs to that school of political historians that seeks to follow in the footsteps of Leopold von

Ranke. To the writers of this school history is chiefly "past politics", and their interests lie in the state and its development and in the statesmen and politicians of the past, rather than in cultural and social forces and the growth of civilization. This volume is, therefore, a survey of England's political history and problems of statecraft.

In his preface, Dr. Salomon explains that he was influenced to write this work because of the lack of any general survey of English history in the German language. Also, he suggests that a foreigner may be able to write of the political development of another country with a broader and more understanding viewpoint, because of its objectivity, than a native of that country. To Dr. Salomon England is an interesting and important historical phenomenon, to be carefully and scientifically examined and diagnosed so as to make clear her political growth and development toward nationalism and imperialism and to indicate the present state of her political health and constitution.

Dr. Salomon carries out the purpose announced in his preface with great skill and ability. His volume is divided into eight chapters or parts, with a brief bibliographical appendix, in which only a few leading secondary works are listed, and a fairly adequate index. Out of 334 pages of text, only 87 are devoted to the periods before 1603, although these periods occupy the first four chapters. In general, the treatment of men and events is thoroughly orthodox and reflects the influence of leading English political historians. The last two chapters of the book, dealing with the period since 1783, are more original and indicate that Dr. Salomon is especially interested in British world power and imperialism. His account does not venture in detail beyond 1914, but in a brief summary and conclusion he points out that the World War has had a markedly decentralizing influence on the British Empire. He maintains that Great Britain is now both a European power and a partner in a British commonwealth of nations.

In general, Dr. Salomon is to be commended for having produced a book of accurate and workmanlike type and one that shows good scholarship. This volume should meet the need that has existed in Germany for a general survey of English political origins and development.

N. M. TREN HOLME.

Mittelalter: ein Geschichtlicher Ueberblick. Von Dietrich Schäfer. (Munich and Berlin, Druck und Verlag von R. Oldenbourg, 1923, pp. viii, 160, \$80.) This book is a portion of a projected *Lehrbuch* edited by Gymnasium Direktor Arnold Reimann. It is written especially for a German audience at one of the darkest moments in German history, with the avowed purpose of interpreting to the reader the successes and failures of Germany in the Middle Ages in the belief that he who would intelligently participate in the reconstruction of the German state must understand the somewhat similar dangers which once before brought

that state to the borders of ruin. The greatness of the German past, the achievements under stress, the perils and losses in time of disunion, the value of German *Schaffensfreudigkeit* are the dominant notes.

The fusion of Roman and German elements in the early Middle Ages is almost wholly rejected. All the basic institutions of the Middle Ages were of German, not of Roman, origin. In view of the victory of German institutions in the century after the migrations, the cultural inferiority of the Germans has been erroneously assumed and must be relegated to the land of fable. Charlemagne, Alfred the Great, Rurik and his brothers were the founders of the new régime: "Wie im Abendlande, so waren aber auch gegen Morgen Germanen die Begründer neuer Staaten geworden. Mittelalterlichem Staatsleben, das will sagen dem Staatsleben der Zukunft, haben sie den Ursprung gegeben" (p. 31). "Nichts unterscheidet das Mittelalter mehr vom Altertum, als dass an die Stelle der antiken Verbindung von Staat und Kirche das Nebeneinander der beiden Gewalten gesetzt hat. Darauf beruht aber die Eigenart, die Stärke europäisch-abendländischen Entwicklung. Man beachte, dass sie germanischen, nicht römischen Ursprungs ist" (p. 62).

German *Eroberungssucht* did not exist in the Middle Ages. Otto the Great in France, in Upper Burgundy, in Italy sought only to secure his inherited sovereignty. Barbarossa in his struggle against the Italian cities was acting as King of Italy in whom rested not only the right but the duty to wield right and justice. As for Henry II. of England—of whose judicial and legal work not a word—"Nie hat den deutschen Thron eine ähnliche Eroberernatur inne gehabt" (p. 104).

The expansion of Germany to the eastward is admirably treated along broad lines, with a sigh that the hitherto most successful people in the field of foreign colonization should have been excluded from participation in the movement of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries because of lack of political unity. The elaborate interpretation of the rôle of the Church and of its relations with the Empire is for the most part well conceived and executed. The brief passage on the reasons for the decay of the Roman state is almost brilliant considering its brevity and might serve as an example to the writers of text-books in English on the Middle Ages. Throughout, the facts are cleverly selected, well marshalled so as to give space as far as may be to interpretation. "Gerade die Erinnerung an unser Mittelalter hat in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts mitgeholfen zum Wiederaufstieg; sie kann auch heute noch solche Wirkung äussern" (p. 143). The book is interesting to readers outside Germany when read in that light.

There is a chronological table, and seven selected documents are given in Latin in an appendix.

EUGENE H. BYRNE.

Éginhard, Vie de Charlemagne. Éditée et traduite par Louis Halphen, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux. [Les Classiques de

[*L'Histoire de France au Moyen Age*, publiés sous la direction de Louis Halphen.] (Paris, Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1923, pp. xxiii, 127, 7.50 fr.) Students of the Middle Ages who have been accustomed to use the handy volumes of the *In Usum Scholarum* series of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* or of the *Collection de Textes pour servir à l'Étude et à l'Enseignement de l'Histoire* will welcome the inauguration of a new series of small and inexpensive volumes entitled *Les Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Age*, which is being published by the firm of Champion under the general editorship of Louis Halphen. If the quality of the series as a whole may be judged by that of the first volume, which has now appeared—Einhard's *Life of Charlemagne*, edited by Halphen himself—the success of the venture may be regarded as already assured, and the series will doubtless grow to many volumes. The texts are to be based on a fresh and critical examination of the principal manuscripts (*manuscrits types*), and significant variants are to be given, but a burdensome accumulation of critical apparatus is to be avoided. When texts are in Latin, Provençal, or difficult archaic French, they are to be accompanied by faithful modern French translations; and texts and translations are to be printed on opposite pages according to the plan now familiar to all readers of the *Locüb Classical Library*. Introductions and notes are to be brief and concise but to contain everything necessary for an intelligent use of the texts and for distinguishing original from copied or derived matter.

It is safe to say that no other French scholar is so well qualified as Halphen to prepare a new edition of Einhard's famous biography. In his *Études Critiques sur l'Histoire de Charlemagne*, already reviewed in this journal, he has shown himself more than a master of the sources for the Carolingian epoch. He has arrived at new conclusions of far-reaching importance with respect to the value of Einhard's writings, and he has shown the need of a new edition of the *Vita Caroli* which would distinguish that which is Einhard's own from that which he derived from others. In the introduction to the little volume now at hand he has summarized the important conclusions of his earlier studies; and in the invaluable notes which accompany the text he has shown at every point the sources from which Einhard derived his matter. For this reason Halphen's text must now be used in preference to all others. The translation is both accurate and readable. It may be noted in passing that text and translation can be purchased separately at reduced prices.

Since Halphen has taught us to rate the historical authority of Einhard much lower than we formerly did, it is good to know that the *Royal Annals*, the principal source from which Einhard drew, are soon to appear in *Les Classiques de l'Histoire de France au Moyen Age*, and that they too are to be edited by Halphen himself.

C. W. DAVID.

Vassar Mediaeval Studies. By Members of the Faculty of Vassar College. Edited by Christabel Forsyth Fiske, Ph.D., Associate Professor of English. (New Haven, Yale University Press; London, Humphrey Milford, 1923, pp. xii, 493, \$5.00.) Sixteen persons, now or recently members of the faculty of Vassar College, have at President MacCracken's suggestion combined to produce a pleasant volume of essays on medieval topics, dedicated to the late George E. Dimock, a trustee who "wholeheartedly believed in" research by the teaching body. For the most part these sixteen studies deal with medieval literature and art. Twelve were contributed by the various departments of literature, art, and music. Two of the three from the history department treat of medieval attitudes toward books. Two papers represent other aspects of the period, Professor Baldwin's instructive discussion of Litigation in English Society, the use and abuse of common law before the establishment of Tudor despotism, and Professor Cowley's description of a fourteenth-century arithmetical treatise owned by Columbia University. Her illustrations of the methods of calculation, problems set for solution, tables for money-changing, rates of interest, wages, prices, and other matter contained in the manuscript open, as it were, a window into the dim interior of a Florentine counting-house.

Three essays will attract the humanist, Professor Thallon's account of Michael Akominatos, archbishop of Athens in 1204, Professor Bourne's analysis of classical elements in the *Gesta Romanorum*, and Professor Coulter's review of the sources of Boccaccio's *Gencalogia Dcorum*. One wishes only that Dr. Thallon had omitted the better known material from Matthew Paris and other chroniclers in favor of extracts from Akominatos's writings, still inaccessible except in Greek. In view of the Levant Company, the relations of seventeenth and eighteenth century travellers and the wide-spread interest in the "Soldan", one must protest against her statement that the Turkish conquest "blotted the Aegean from the map of Europe" until the recovery of Greek independence (p. 275). Nor can one overlook Professor Coulter's rash assumption that Boccaccio's denunciation of tyrants proves that he anticipated democracy or anything else resembling "modern theories of government" (p. 321).

Professor Brown's sources for her breezy disquisition on Book Burning should include Bernard Guy's *Practica Inquisitionis Hereticae Pravitatis*, which gives with much else the formula for requisition, throughout a district, of all copies of blasphemous and shocking Jewish books to be burned by the seneschal. Of general interest are Professor Smith's philosophical explanation of the significance of the comedy element in English and Scottish ballads and Professor Loomis's persuasive argument for recognition of the kinship between the wailing queens who bore Arthur to Avalon and the Banshee that still cries for the passing of a man of ancient Irish blood.

L. R. L.

Guelfes et Gibelins. Par Dom Charles Poulet. Volume I. *La Lutte du Sacerdoce et de l'Empire (1152-1250).* Volume II. *La Diplomatie Pontificale à l'Époque de la Domination Française (1266-1378).* [Collection Lovanium, V.] (Brussels and Paris, Vromant et Compagnie, 1922, pp. 246, 236, 7 fr. each.) This is a popular treatment of the two-hundred-year struggle between Church and State. The author's point of view is that the Guelfs were the defenders of Italian and papal liberties against the intermeddling of the Germans; that the quarrel of the papacy and the Empire should be compared with the great wars of national defense, for example, with that of Spain against Napoleon. The Guelfism of the Angevins displaced the Ghibellinism of the Hohenstaufen only to put Italy and the papacy in the same dangers as before. The results both in Germany and Italy were of course anarchy and confusion; for the papacy, Anagni and Avignon; in Italy also a revival of Ghibellinism, for the most part literary and sentimental. God raised the warrior statesman Albornoz to make possible the return of the popes to Rome, a Saint Catherine of unalloyed Guelfism to lead the way. The causes of the final disaster, the Great Schism, therefore lie deep and the responsibility is divided. Without national *parti pris* it can be affirmed that the responsibility was no less Italian than French, while in the background loom the dominating claims of the Hohenstaufen and the egoism of the cities. The French profited by the anarchy in Italy to meddle there, but assumed the position of protectors of the popes and not of aggressors: no one can place the Angevins and the Hohenstaufen on the same plane. The Schism was the ultimate consequence of the struggle between Guelfs and Ghibellines, unless it were the Reformation itself, a "gibelinisme lointain".

In the introduction (p. 21) the author asks rhetorically whether, when one studies the history of the Church, one should not rise above questions of personality and of nationality? Whether a high impartiality is not absolutely imposed? Yet the first volume, occupied wholly with the Hohenstaufen struggle, is permeated with hatred of the Staufen, and it would seem of the Germans generally, is tinged with the darkest colors of the years since 1914. Why should scholars of our day, writing of the Middle Ages, fan the flames of recent hatred with cries of Pan-Germanism, with far-fetched repetitions of "*Deutschland ueber Alles*" (I. 41, 187)? Is it fair to say that the Germans of the later Staufen period, whose grandchildren were to acclaim Luther, had lost every sane concept of Christianity (I. 183)? Or that the struggle had developed in the Germans a virus of hatred for the Romans, which, working through long centuries, matured the Reformation (II. 230)? One is not surprised therefore to meet in these pages, in connection with Barbarossa's agreements, the phrase "chiffons de papier" (I. 86)! Surely, even from martyred Louvain, and with the *Imprimatur* on the title-page, one might hope for some restraint.

The minor defects are few. The excellences are many. The style is entertaining. The work will no doubt be widely read in the European Catholic world. But the final effect is painful.

EUGENE H. BYRNE.

Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquis of Salisbury, etc., preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire. Part XIV. Addenda. [Historical Manuscripts Commission.] (London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1923, pp. xviii, 406, 8 s. 9 d.) This is the last installment of the long and valuable series of volumes calendaring the manuscripts at Hatfield House for the reign of Elizabeth. The close connection of Lord Burghley and Sir Robert Cecil with Elizabeth's administration and the extent to which official papers at that time made their way into private muniment-rooms have given the series of fourteen volumes almost the value and authority of a government record, and their publication has been an inestimable boon to scholars. This volume, along with the next preceding, includes the documents that were laid aside in the process of arranging the main body of records in the hope of being able to date them more exactly than was possible from obvious data. Many of them, therefore, can be assigned only to some one year, others not even so closely as that. The last fifty pages in fact are devoted to documents of which it can only be said that they belong to the reign of Elizabeth.

Naturally the contents of this volume are not so interesting as those of the earlier volumes, and there is but little that is actually new or of great significance. The pages on pages of petitions to Robert Cecil, on all conceivable subjects, suggest the varied interests and growing influence of the queen's secretary; the numerous news-letters in 1602 are early examples of that interesting but somewhat untrustworthy class of sources; a series of enlightened suggestions by Lord Mountjoy for the government of Ireland comes from a crucial period in the relations between the two countries; there are a number of particularly free-spoken letters from Cecil to a special correspondent in Scotland. No such mass of original record can fail to throw much light on the time. This volume continues with only somewhat diminished brightness the illumination we owe to the great series it brings to a conclusion. The introduction, it may be said, is somewhat perfunctory, but it could hardly be otherwise in the case of the last volume of so long a series, and that a volume of *disjecta membra*.

E. P. CHEYNEY.

Le Déclin de l'Humanisme Belge: Étude sur Jean-Gaspard Gevaerts, Philologue et Poète (1593-1666). Par Marcel Hoc, Docteur en Philosophie et Lettres, Professeur à l'Athénée Royal de Verviers. [Fondation Universitaire de Belgique.] (Brussels, Éditions Robert Sand, 1922, pp. 240, 25 fr.) Specialization has outgrown the student's memory and his purse. Two hundred and forty pages and twenty-five francs for the life history of a scholar whose name is not recorded in the *Encyclopaedia*

Britannica or in Sandys's *History of Classical Philology*! But the work was worth doing. Gevaerts, like many other now forgotten worthies, was a personage in his day and, as the title-page indicates, a type that characterizes the scholarship of an epoch. His youthful edition of Statius and his three books of *Eclecta* gave promise that he would prove a not unworthy successor of his teacher Schott, a pupil of the great Justus Lipsius. But the fortune or misfortune that procured him at the early age of twenty-eight the lucrative but distracting post of secretary of the city of Antwerp diverted his energies into another channel. He still read widely, collected coins and medals, corresponded with scholars about his promised but never quite completed edition of Marcus Aurelius and Manilius. But he completed nothing for publication except the official *éloges* of visiting princes, the inscriptions in their honor, the descriptions of the fêtes that welcomed them to Antwerp, the epitaphs and the Latin poems of occasion by which he will be remembered—if at all.

All this as well as his scholarship is competently and critically studied, largely from unprinted sources, by Dr. Hoc. The most interesting feature of the book is the account of Gevaerts's friendship with Rubens and their co-operation in the organization and published descriptions of such festivals as that which celebrated the visit to Antwerp in 1635 of Ferdinand, cardinal and archbishop of Toledo and brother of Philip IV. of Spain. Here as elsewhere Gevaerts supplied most of Rubens's classical scholarship and supplemented it with interpretations and classical parallels from his own immense reading that it is the fashion to flout as pedantry now, as it was the fashion to admire then. The specialist will find much else in Dr. Hoc's book—text-criticism of Statius, the progress of numismatic study in the seventeenth century, an account of Gevaerts's library, his Latin correspondence, and his Latin verse, which is uninspired, but for those who like that sort of thing not unreadable in its fluent rhythm and rhetoric. I have not the library to test Dr. Hoc's work. There are some misprints in Greek quotations. There always are in these days. In the Latin poem on Jeanne d'Arc (p. 38) the third line will not construe unless the comma after *Alea* is removed, and for *attollit cordis accertos* we must read *caedis accertos*. As Gevaerts himself remarks in a letter to Heinsius, "nihil certius est hac nostra emendatione".

PAUL SHOREY.

Danmark-Norges Traktater, 1523-1750, med dertil hørende Aktstykker. (Traités du Danemark et de la Norvège.) Paa Carlsbergfondets Bekostning udgivne af L. Laursen. Bind IV., 1626-1649; Bind V., 1651-1664. (Copenhagen, G. E. C. Gad, 1917, 1920, pp. 695, 628.) Herre Laursen's edition of Danish-Norwegian treaties ranks with the best collections of documents of this class. When completed it will fill an important gap in the literature of diplomatic history. No general collection of Danish treaties concluded before 1751 has hitherto been printed. The best substitute has been H. C. de Reedtz's *Répertoire Historique et*

Chronologique des Traités conclus par la Couronne de Dano-Norvège depuis Canut-le-Grand jusqu'à 1800, a small volume, containing, for the most part, merely brief abstracts of treaties. Herre Laursen's monumental work will cover definitively the period from 1523 to 1750. It aims at including all treaties and conventions of an international character made with foreign powers by the Danish-Norwegian kings, acting either in their royal capacity, or as dukes of Sleswick and Holstein; marriage treaties, and renunciations of heritage; and conventions made by the King of Denmark, whether as king, or as duke of Sleswick and Holstein, with other dukes of the same duchies, or with the chapters of various bishops of North Germany. Treaties not ratified by one of the parties are all included, because of their historical interest, as are also a few declarations, resolutions, letters patent, and other supplementary documents. About half of each of the volumes here noticed consists of the historical introductions to the treaties. These detailed accounts of the negotiations, based largely upon state papers in the Danish archives and in part on published material, form an important contribution to the diplomatic history of Europe.

While the volumes under review have no direct bearing upon American history, yet they reflect to some extent the interest of Christian IV. in overseas trade and his claim to a right to share in it. In particular, the negotiations for a commercial treaty, conducted for Denmark by Hannibal Sehested at the Spanish court at the end of the year 1640 and the beginning of the year 1641, reveal his master's eagerness for direct trade connection between Danish lands and Spain and her colonies. Christian IV.'s main interest was in the East Indies, which, together with Portugal, were slipping from Spanish control during the very period of Sehested's negotiations. When Count Olivares brought up the delicate point of the right of the Danes to sail to the Indies, and proposed a special agreement on the matter between Spain and Denmark, Sehested declared that his master "could not take account of the papal division of the East Indies between Spain and Portugal, which was the only foundation these two countries had for their asserted right over the East Indies". Sehested declared that Spain's persistent claim to a monopoly of the Indies must be expected to influence the attitude of his master toward the Duke of Braganza. But even this threat did not drive the King of Spain from his position that the article in the commercial treaty permitting Danes to trade to his kingdoms, lands, and provinces, was to be understood as referring only to Europe. After the conclusion of the treaty, Christian IV., on the other hand, remained determined not to give up his right to sail to the Indies.

F. G. D.

Die Drei Englisch-Holländischen Seekriege 1652-1654, 1664-1667, 1672-1674, sowie der Schwedisch-Holländische Seekrieg 1658-1659. Von Dr. Phil. Carl Ballhausen. I. Der Erste Englisch-Holländische Seekrieg

1652-1654, sowie der Schwedisch-Holländische Seekrieg 1658-1659. (The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1923, pp. xxiii, 804, 16 guilders.) There is only one adjective which can properly be applied to this great work by Dr. Ballhausen, and it is German—it is "kolossal". The author has set himself the task of describing, evaluating, and documenting the three Anglo-Dutch wars of 1652-1654, 1664-1667, and 1672-1674, together with the Swedish-Dutch war of 1658-1659. The latter, with the first Anglo-Dutch war, forms the theme of the present study of some eight hundred octavo pages, and it is to be presumed that we shall have at least another volume of this size to complete the task. The very magnitude of this monograph is perhaps the best evaluation of it. It is preceded by an exhaustive alphabetical list of the chief sources for the subject and period, and it has a full index. Some 275 pages are devoted to the background and the preparation as well as the technical details of sea-fighting, the rest of the volume to the actual conflict. Suggested apparently by the celebration of the tercentenary of De Ruyter's birth in 1907, it would appear that this comprehensive work had absorbed most of the author's time since. He has been successful. He has produced not only a history of these wars, he has written an encyclopaedia about them.

England under the Restoration (1660-1688). By Thora G. Stone, M.A. With a Preface by A. F. Pollard, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A., Fellow of All Souls and Professor of English History in the University of London. [University of London Intermediate Source-books of History, no. IV.] (London and New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1923, pp. xix, 260, 10 s. 6 d.) To the first three volumes of the London Intermediate Source-books of History Miss Stone has added a fourth on the Restoration, which bears out the character of its predecessors. It may be questioned whether a selection of sources on any modern period quite equals that on an era when material is scantier—but that may be as much a qualification of medieval scarcity as of modern surfeit. Certainly Miss Stone's work leaves little to be desired in such a book. It is preceded by an excellent note on the sources. It has a good index. It is full of interesting material of almost every conceivable description from State Papers to James II.'s visit to the Chatham dockyard and the commercial value of Newfoundland. It differs from most collections of this kind in its references to manuscript materials, and it is, in little, a sort of introduction to the literature of the Restoration historically considered. Indeed it is difficult to see how it could be bettered for its purpose—only, where is Rugge's Diary? Has the reviewer missed it, or the author, or is it no longer reckoned worth noting?

The Decay of Capitalist Civilization. By Sidney and Beatrice Webb. (New York, Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1923, pp. xvii, 242, \$1.75.) The mill of the Webbs grinds continuously, but few will complain as long as the grist is of high order. There is no chaff, no feed to be sold at so much

per ton, only compilations, constructive treatises, and critical works, generally of fine quality. The present book belongs to the last-named type, the critical. Three chapters set forth the social inequalities of to-day. The fourth, which is of value to the student of modern history, deals substantially with the Industrial Revolution. The last two chapters contain the familiar indictment against capitalism: for example, the destruction of labor force, adulteration of goods, business depressions, monopoly prices, and international and class wars.

The theses of this book are that, from about 1750 to about 1850, capitalism had considerable success in increasing production. This was at a time when, in the absence of co-operative enterprise, common honesty, and political administrative machinery, only private individuals, stimulated by personal greed, could make progress. About 1850, "profit-making became increasingly subject to malignant growths and perverted metabolisms, which created their own poisons and lessened the advantages of the system itself" (pp. 108-109). And since about 1870, "alternative methods of organizing industry", superior in production, distribution, and consumption, have been evolved. These are, of course, the various kinds of socialism.

The authors hold to the comfortable philosophy that it is possible for the poor to have much that the rich now enjoy. They do not ignore, however, the necessity of efficient production; they believe that socialism will be more effective than capitalism. Of course, this is a matter of theory, predilection, and guess. It seems confusing to lump all the enemies of socialism together as capitalists and to condemn them all as such. This is an old device of those who scorn without trying to understand. To regard the capitalistic order as essentially bad, because filled with evils during the period of introduction, is to show that the study of history, however long continued, has struck no deep root. One wonders whether bankruptcy of new ideas has become the characteristic of the socialists as well as the conservatives. Perhaps this is a good omen for actual social reconstruction, in which experimentation with situations counts more than conflicting theories.

The value of this book is threefold. It contains summary judgments of past conditions of society, most if not all of which, however, are familiar to the scholar. It presents a searching criticism of the present order. And for the historian of theory, it unfolds the social philosophy of the intellectual—change, social control, and greater well-being for the masses.

N. S. B. GRAS.

The French Revolution. By George H. Allen, Ph.D., Fellow in Classical Archaeology, American School of Classical Studies, Rome. Volume II. *The Upheaval.* (Philadelphia, George Barrie's Sons, 1923, pp. xviii, 351, \$9.00.) This volume (for vol. I. see this *Review*, XXVIII, 115-116), with the subtitle of *The Upheaval*, covers the period from the

fall of the Bastille to the meeting of the Convention. As it is addressed primarily to a popular audience the emphasis is upon the incidents which are readily presented in narrative form. It includes, however, chapters on the Reformers and their Reforms, and the Constitution of 1791. The latter is hardly more than a résumé of the principal provisions of the document. If space can be found for a treatment of that type, it is not unfair to ask why the other chapter gives so slight an account of the great reforms of the Constituent Assembly. The brief description of the abolition of feudalism appears in another part of the book and is neither clear nor correct. The new scheme of taxes is only mentioned in passing. As the causes of the Revolution are confessedly social and financial, the remedies which the Constituent sought to apply should not be superficially treated in a work aiming to be comprehensive. The author's allusions to these aspects are inadequate. For example, the first assignats are described as "national bills . . . allotted or assigned for redemption to specific parts of the public domain". This is not the fact. The law simply provided that when public lands were sold at auction successful bidders could pay in assignats. The mandats of 1796 had a closer connection with the land, because the holder could file a proposal for any desired piece of property and if he could reach an agreement with the government appraiser could immediately take title. Even those sections of this work which deal with the external history of the Revolution contain many questionable statements. The remark that "Wordsworth expressed in his *Prelude*, in 1792, his somewhat mystic enthusiasms for the Revolution" may be only a slip in the matter of dates, but assertions contained in the chapter on the Massacres of September are more serious. Without warning the reader that the whole subject is still involved in controversy, the author says that Danton was present at meetings where the details were planned. He also says that Robespierre was an occasional visitor at those meetings. He makes the remark that "excepting Pétion, Mayor of Paris, the Girondins took no part in the Massacres". This implies that Pétion did take part, whereas his only action was a futile effort to stop them. The volume is furnished with many interesting plates.

B.

Les Jacobins de Colmar: Procès-Verbaux des Séances de la Société Populaire (1791-1795), publiés avec une introduction et des notes par Paul Leuilliot. [Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, fascicule 9.] (Strasbourg and Paris, Istra, 1923, pp. xxxiv, 503, 25 fr.) This volume of the *Procès-Verbaux* of the Jacobin Club of Colmar, edited with introduction and notes by M. Leuilliot, was presented as a "mémoire pour le diplôme d'études supérieures d'histoire et de géographie devant la faculté des lettres" of the University of Strasbourg. It is an important piece of historical work excellently done. The introduction contains a discussion of the sources of the *procès-ver-*

baux and a sketch of the history of the society, based on the *procès-verbaux* and other documents. The editing is very thoroughly done, half the volume being made up of foot-notes, explanatory of the text and of documents referred to in the text. It is in truth a model of how such a piece of work should be done, and every student of the club movement in France during the Revolution who has occasion to use M. Leuilliot's volume will feel grateful to him. Although the society was organized January 30, 1791, the minutes for 1791, 1792, and 1793 occupy only eighty-seven pages. The society begins its vigorous life in February, 1794, and 325 pages, out of 445, are devoted to the activities of that hectic year. What we have, then, are the minutes of a Jacobin Club in Alsace in the critical year 1794. They are vastly instructive touching topics common to all the *procès-verbaux* that have been published, such as the "maximum", the assignats, the Church, emigration, the aristocrats, the army, the revolutionary tribunal, and the attitude of the club toward the changes taking place in the Convention; but their chief interest lies in matters peculiar to Alsace, to its position as a frontier department and its problem of two languages—one of the most perplexing problems that the society had to deal with was that of finding teachers of French for the schools of Alsace. In this respect the volume occupies a unique position among the source-volumes that have been published up to the present time on the Jacobin clubs of France.

F. M. F.

Un Agent Inconnu de la Coalition: le Général de Stamford d'après sa Correspondance Inédite (1793-1806). Par Commandant M.-H. Weil. (Paris, Payot et Cie., 1923, pp. 828, iv, 30 fr.) Times and the views of archivists change. Twenty years ago the reviewer copied a despatch written in 1800 in which the writer alluded to the fact that General Stamford, nominally a representative of the House of Orange, was actually in the pay of the English government. That was the only sentence blacked out by the industrious old gentleman who read the copies for the Foreign Office. Now the same records yield an eight-hundred page book to the indefatigable Commandant Weil, and the salary of Stamford is shamelessly set forth with all his reports, at a time when paper, ink, and labor supposedly keep any but exceptionally important or salable works from appearing.

Stamford, who despite his name was French born and bred, was a sworn opponent of everything Revolutionary. The world had to be made safe again for dynasties. The House of Orange was served faithfully by Stamford as their representative, chiefly in Berlin, often at the court of the Duke of Brunswick, and on occasion and to no purpose in St. Petersburg and Vienna. The representative of a lesser state at the Prussian court when Prussia's whole policy was neutral, more neutral, and still more neutral, he could only write despatches, organize information services in France, and wear himself out in activities that the Gren-

villes at least appreciated enough to subsidize. Naturally Stamford never got very deep into any very important matters and the information he received from Paris sounds ludicrous. Intelligence services to-day are filling the archives with similar material for better salaries. Stamford probably wrote more despatches between 1795 and 1806 than were found in the Record Office by Hubert Hall, and M. Weil regrets his inability to unearth them. Inasmuch as this stout volume adds nothing of importance to our knowledge of leading persons or events, one must leave him alone to his grief. The Stamford papers were in any case numerous enough to have made a volume without reprinting material from the *Dropmore Papers*. Much of the biographical material in the foot-notes and the two hundred pages of addenda could have been spared. They are evidences of the editor's great industry but not a tribute to his discrimination. Even extensive use of the French archives does not enhance the value of the work, for Bailleu and others have covered too thoroughly the Prussian and French relations in this period.

G. S. FORD.

I Moti del 1820 e del 1821 nelle Carte Bolognesi. (Bologna, Nicola Zanichelli, 1923, pp. xvii, 381, 17.50 lire.) The centenary of the Italian revolutions of 1820 and 1821 has brought forth a number of important studies based upon unpublished contemporary documents. Of these studies the present volume, prepared by the Comitato Romagnolo of the Società Nazionale per la Storia del Risorgimento Italiano, is a scholarly and valuable historical contribution. Bologna was a strategic point for Austrian armies moving south in the interest of foreign domination and dynastic oppression, and it was also a fulcrum for the reactionary temporal power of the popes in their efforts to make their influence increasingly felt in the north. To-day, when Austria as an imperial menace to the independence of Italy has disappeared, and the papacy, tacitly renouncing its temporal claims, is working for the prosperity and consolidation of United Italy, such a volume as this is of political as well as historical importance; for it is only by an understanding of past, seemingly unsurmountable, obstacles to Italian independence and unity which have been overcome in a century, that one can estimate justly the strength of the Italians as a people and as a nation.

The Bologna documents give ample evidence of the abuses practised by the Austrian troops in the progress of marches back and forth through the papal legations on their mission to quench the revolution of Naples; and the evidence makes clear the resultant provocation of anti-Austrian feeling in the papal population which had hitherto inclined in some of its liberal circles to look to the Austrian government as preferable to that of the priests. This change of liberal sentiment in the papal provinces was an important factor in the unification of Italian national feeling. The documents upon the Austrian army are taken from the R. Archivio di

Stato in Bologna and are edited by Fulvio Cantoni under the title: *Il Transito dell'I. R. Armata per Bologna nel 1821.*

Another section of the volume edited by Cantoni is important for the life of Federico Confalonieri, 1820-1821; a third section, edited by Albano Sorbelli, gives Piero Maroncelli's account of imprisonment in Spielberg; and a fourth, edited by Senator Alberto Dallolio, relates to revolutionary proceedings in different parts of Italy from 1820 to 1822. These three last-mentioned sections are based upon a remarkable chronicle kept by Francesco Rangone, 1814-1845, preserved in forty-eight large manuscript volumes in the Biblioteca Comunale dell'Archiginnasio in Bologna, and upon Rangone's correspondence preserved in forty-two manuscript volumes in the same library. Rangone was a keen observer and far in advance of his time, along many lines, as a political thinker; his manuscript volumes constitute a monumental, and for the most part a virgin, source for the future historian.

The three editors of the present volume have done their work objectively and altogether creditably.

H. NELSON GAY.

Carlo Alberto e Giuseppe Mazzini: Studi e Ricerche di Storia del Risorgimento. Per Alessandro Luzio. (Turin, Fratelli Bocca, 1923, pp. viii, 510, 30 lire.) The name of Luzio is a guaranty of scholarship and interest for any volume produced over his signature. The present work consists in part of essays already published by him between 1915 and 1921 in the popular Italian review *La Lettura*, to which he has here added many important documents from the R. Archivio di Stato in Turin. It would have been useful, if Luzio had himself indicated clearly which of the documents are new in this volume. We may do so here summarily: To the essay on *Carlo Alberto e la Rivoluzione Piemontese del '21* are added appendixes including letters, in part unpublished, of Carlo Felice to Vittorio Emanuele I., 1821-1822, and of Maria Teresa to her nephew Carlo Alberto, 1821; to *I Processi della Giovine Italia 1833-34, secondo gli Atti Officiali* are added two important unpublished letters of Carlo Alberto, letters of Della Scarena, documents regarding Jacopo Ruffini, etc.; to *Marx e Mazzini* is added an appendix upon the correspondence between Marx and Lassalle published in the third volume of Lassalle's works.

Of the essays not reproduced from *La Lettura* the most important relates to the imprisonment of Angelo Brofferio in 1831, giving the text of his judicial examination, together with other documents from the R. Archivio di Stato in Turin upon his disclosures of the action of his fellow conspirators. Luzio attempts to attenuate somewhat the gravity of Brofferio's treacherous revelations, but the documents are irreparably damning to the latter's character.

Several essays, beside those already mentioned, relate directly or indirectly to Mazzini; of these one concerns the revolutionary events of

Genoa and the imprisonment of Jessie White Mario in 1857, based upon unpublished documents in the Museo del Risorgimento di Genova and in the *dossiers* of the Piedmontese Ministry of the Interior now in the R. Archivio di Stato in Turin; another, maintaining the author's belief in Mazzini's complicity in political assassination, tends to justify in a measure governmental retaliatory acts of repression.

Luzio's violent criticism of the editors of the great national publication of Mazzini's works now in progress is for the most part distorted and unjust.

The volume is marred in its English quotations by many errors of orthography. And it is difficult to understand Luzio's reticence as a scholar in failing to give precise indications as to where the originals of his individual unpublished documents are to be found.

Published as no. 283 in the collection *Piccola Biblioteca di Scienza Moderna*.

H. NELSON GAY.

Napoléon III. and Italy: a Brief Historical Survey. By Robert Holmes Edleston, F.S.A., F.R.G.S. New issue, with introduction by Gerald Headlam. [Three parts in one volume.] (Darlington, Bailey and Company, Printers, 1922, pp. [8], 160; viii, 161-513, [2]; vii, 514-797, 15s.) The scholarly studies of Simpson and the sparkling journalism of Guedalla indicate a revival of interest in Napoleon III. This interest has been not unmixed with sympathy. In the case before us it mounts to violent partizanship. "It is the endeavour of this humble volume to shew", ran Mr. Edleston's preface in 1908, "that the Emperor of the French pursued a consistent and reasonable policy, although he may have been too Liberal for the Conservatives, and too Conservative for the Radicals." The humble volume, which dealt with the period from 1830 to 1860, was followed by another in 1911, covering the years from 1860 to 1865, and a third in 1913, bringing the story to 1868. These three are now published together.

The emperor's Italian policy in broad outline called for a confederation under the pope, a European congress, the cession of Nice and Savoy, a lay governor in the Romagna, disapproval of Garibaldi, evacuation of Rome while safeguarding the temporal power, if possible by reconciliation between the pope and Italy, the peaceful surrender of Venetia by Austria in exchange for the Danubian principalities, Bosnia and Herzegovina, or other territory. If not Cavour's free church in a free state, the essence of Napoleon's plan was an independent papal state in an independent Italy. This policy, which the author praises in every detail, was frustrated by the "criminal revolution" (p. 121) and the "criminal intervention of Sardinia" (p. 213). The latter is, in general, the villain of the plot, while Naples and the papacy are the martyrs.

The chief value of the book lies in its extensive reproduction of documents, often in the original French or Italian. It is, however, biased

and badly written, discursive and lacking organization. It is without index. There is little here that is not better told in the volumes of Thayer, King, and Trevelyan.

EUGENE N. CURTIS.

Food Production in War. By Thomas Hudson Middleton, K.B.E., C.B., LL.D., Deputy Director-General, Food Production Department. [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *Economic and Social History of the World War*, James T. Shotwell, General Editor.] (Oxford, Clarendon Press; London, Humphrey Milford, 1923, pp. xix, 373, 10s. 6d.) Within the scope obviously set by himself, the author of this treatise has executed the project with precision. It could not have been easy to effect the translation outside the war environment. The writer, a distinguished authority on agriculture, was in the thick of the contest over agricultural policy in the United Kingdom during the war. It was a contest embittered by class prejudice and intensified by conflict of interests as well as opinions. Objectively, in a spirit of tolerance and historical accuracy, the reader is conducted over the field. The appropriate background is provided, the centuries-old conflict between the plough and the pasture. There was so much in controversy. At one time it was military *vs.* civilian; then city *vs.* country; then shells *vs.* wheat; then grain *vs.* animals. Agricultural production, as well as food control, was bungled until 1917, fairly in accordance with "muddling through". It was not until the crop year 1918 that a programme of increased food production was seriously undertaken. The larger part of the book is devoted to the reasons for the programme, the methods of operation, the justification of procedures, and the tabulation of results. As a picture of war-made agriculture, it is successful, just as the thing itself was successful.

It is the near view presented to us. The author takes great pains to prove, as an accountant, that the programme paid its way. The costs are stated to have been something over nine million pounds sterling; the direct returns were half of that, the indirect returns as much more. This computation was not necessary—the programme was justified by the insurance—and it is not convincing, because the view is too short. Indeed, it would have been better if the work had been written in 1925, instead of late in 1921. British agriculture is in distress. The distress was derived in part from the programme of war production. This programme must be viewed in connection with the programme of food control; they were interrelated. It may be years before the agriculture of the United Kingdom recovers from the war and the business cycle. It is too early to measure the extent to which the war programme of agriculture prepared the farmer for post-war difficulties. Certainly it is not correct to write the history of food production in war as though the operation terminated with the restoration of peace. The author is not unmindful of this

fact, as is evidenced by the final chapter entitled *From Food Production Back to Farming*. The scope of the chapter on present and future is too narrow. But in the main purpose of the work, the presentation is highly successful.

ALONZO ENGLEBERT TAYLOR.

The British Coal-Mining Industry during the War. By Sir R. A. S. Redmayne, K.C.B., Chairman of the Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau. [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *Economic and Social History of the World War*, James T. Shotwell, General Editor.] (Oxford, Clarendon Press; London, Humphrey Milford, 1923, pp. xv, 348. 10s. 6d.) "A sack of coals" would be a better symbol of British industry than the Woolsack. And it would hardly be "a more uncomfortable seat than that occupied by . . . His Majesty's Ministers" who dealt with coal during the war period. So Sir Richard Redmayne, who shared and eased their discomforts as chief technical adviser, begins his account of the coal control.

The author's rare knowledge guaranteed a thoroughly competent narrative; his testimony before the Sankey Commission suggested the hope of an analysis that would bring the war experience sharply into focus to illumine the continuing problems of the industry. The book gives the former but not the latter. Unlike Sir Arthur Salter's courageous companion volume on shipping control, it remains merely a book of chronicles.

"It was imperative at the time to impose unified action in important matters." What matters? And why? These questions the book answers clearly and adequately. Do any of these matters need unified action in time of peace? This problem is never squarely faced. Does railway haulage, for example? (If control saved seven hundred million ton-miles a year?) "Haphazard distribution?" (If in spite of war economies the poor "were never better supplied"?). And how could unified action be secured? The virtue of control, as the author points out, "was in the co-ordination and not in the [government] hand directing it". But this is only the beginning of the question. The industry has never co-ordinated itself; what "hand" can be devised for the purpose?

Redmayne's book will help those who are wrestling with these problems, but his own contribution toward their solution is limited by his official caution and by the barrenness of his old-school economics. "Economic Law" stretches across the last page "on a lettered sash" to bar the way to fresh thinking about the organization of industry.

CARTER GOODRICH.

War and Armament Expenditures of Japan. By Giichi Ono, Counselor of Finance Department. [Publications of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Japanese Monographs, edited by Baron Y. Saka-

tani, D.C.L., formerly Minister of Finance of Japan.] (New York and London, Oxford University Press, 1922, pp. xviii, 314, \$2.25.)

Expenditures of the Sino-Japanese War. By Giichi Ono. [Id.] (Ibid., 1922, pp. xv, 330, \$2.25.)

Expenditures of the Russo-Japanese War. By Gotaro Ogawa, D.C.L., Professor of Finance in the University of Kioto. [Id.] (Ibid., 1923, pp. xvi, 257, \$2.50.) Each one of these three monographs contains an introduction citing the historical events that led up to the wars under consideration. Of the three, Professor Ogawa's is by far the most useful; Mr. Ono's state the official point of view with such extreme bias as to make them worthless.

In addition to the historical matter each volume contains a number of chapters in which are set forth the effects of the various wars upon finance, trade, transportation, manufactures, agriculture, fishing, cost of living, etc. Each of the authors presents a summary of his conclusions: Mr. Ono (*War and Armament Expenditures of Japan*, p. 256) "We do not hesitate, from this point of view, to congratulate ourselves upon a war and particularly upon a victory in war as efficient causes of improvement in national economy"; Professor Ogawa (*Expenditures of the Russo-Japanese War*, p. 252) "Had there been no war at all the national development would have come, perhaps, without incurring any of the economic burdens from which we still suffer."

Voluminous statistical data have been compiled for each of the monographs, but with what effect it is not easy to determine. It is disconcerting, for example, to find that the figures stating the cost of the Chinese war presented by Mr. Ono on page 77 of the first of the volumes under review do not agree with the same author's figures on page 42, foot-note, in the second volume; there is also a discrepancy of over one hundred million yen in the cost of the Russo-Japanese War between Mr. Ono's figures (p. 116) and Professor Ogawa's (p. 107). Moreover it is doubtful whether any foreign reader will be able to absorb much light from figures that preserve all the obscurities of Japanese budget practice, as for example, in the table on page 73 of Mr. Ono's *War and Armament Expenditures of Japan*.

There has long been a conviction among official Japanese at least that books on things Japanese intended for foreign readers should be written by Japanese rather than by foreigners. Evidently the Carnegie Foundation has adopted the Japanese point of view in this matter. The volumes under review, especially Mr. Ono's, cast very grave doubts upon the wisdom of this practice.

W. W. McLAREN.

Industrial History of the United States. By Edward S. Cowdrick, Member, Society of Industrial Engineers. (New York, Ronald Press Company, 1923, pp. viii, 414, \$2.75.) Within a few years a small library of manuals of American economic history has been published. Their

size, scope, method of treatment, and general make-up are similar and have been determined primarily by class-room requirements. Originality in text-books is apt to be confined to methods of presentation rather than matter and doctrine; but even in the former respect writers have not wandered from conventional paths.

A touch of freshness is given to Mr. Cowdrick's book by a suggestion of doctrinal purpose in its argument. He is more concise, especially in his treatment of the earlier period of our history, and rather more sparing of concrete detail, than his predecessors. He surveys industrial development from the standpoint of an engineer and business executive instead of a teacher and places his stresses somewhat differently for that reason. He consciously contrues the broad lessons of our economic history as a vindication of the orthodox principles that have governed our past industrial and commercial life.

Occasionally a statement of fact calls for more qualification than the author gives it, as when he says (p. 98): "The financial collapse of 1837 was the first important business crisis of the several through which the United States has passed"; or a contradiction occurs, as when we are told on page 158 that the South "built no factories" before the war and on page 184 that she "developed few factories previous to the war". But minor lapses are more than compensated by the firm and discriminating handling of greater modern issues, such as the labor question and industrial concentration. Here the author gives interpretations that have been matured—and not seriously diverted from academic objectivity—by practical contact with the problems he discusses. Altogether the book covers its field and serves its purpose creditably.

VICTOR S. CLARK.

Damaged Souls. By Gamaliel Bradford. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1923. pp. xv, 285, \$3.00.) It takes a great deal of resolution to do one's full duty by so delightful a writer as Mr. Bradford. As to the finer side of him—his serenity, his gracefulness, his flashes of epigram, his touches of the real thing in style—all this is too obvious to permit insistence. Any page at random, or at most any five pages, display ample proof. Nevertheless, all this is not of the heart of the matter. Still, as so long ago when he coined the now discarded term "psychography", the real question is, can he give us a convincing sense of a character caught and held in the fluid, changeful medium of words? It seems to the present reviewer, as in the old days before "psychography" was discarded, that all this delightful writing, or most of it, is based on a wrong assumption. Seeking far to find the explanation, perhaps one may come to rest in the notion that Mr. Bradford, after all, is the last word of that preoccupation with the absolute which pervaded a large part of the New England mind in the great days of the last century. Is he not, after all, a product of the world which knew not pragmatism? At least it is fair to say that his conception of character

is static. At the core of every one of us he assumes a fixed unchangeable absolute which is the person. In a sense, of course, we will all admit this as a philosophical probability. This is not Mr. Bradford's mistake. His mistake is in the further belief that he or any man can embody this unknown, this mystery of the individual, in static terms. The older—and one must be allowed to add the surer—artists felt that while they might divine they could not formulate the inner being.

"Unknown to Cromwell as to me,
Was Cromwell's measure and degree."

But Emerson would not have discouraged writing a life of Cromwell. He would have held that by following the actions of the man in their natural order glimpses of the inner, more or less inscrutable, being would successively appear on the surface, and that by relating these in sequence a moving shadow of his soul might be caught in words. That is, not formula but rhythm is the secret of biography. This is the secret of men and writings as diverse as Carlyle's *Sterling*, Pater's *Leonardo*, and Strachey's *Cardinal Manning*. It is because Mr. Bradford has discarded rhythm as his foundation and has staked his all on formula that he is still outside his kingdom.

Of the seven subjects of the book—Arnold, Paine, Burr, Randolph of Roanoke, John Brown, Barnum, Butler—none, at least for the present reviewer, achieve reality. They remain formulas, encrusted with phrases. So often the phrases are sufficiently interesting to constitute a reward in themselves. By the same token, the introductory essay, unembarrassed by a biographical intention, is wholly delightful. If Mr. Bradford would only adopt a sounder technique, abandon formula, and give himself to rhythm, what a delightful biographer he might be.

N. W. S.

Huntington Papers: Correspondence of the Brothers Joshua and Jedediah Huntington during the Period of the American Revolution. In two parts. [Collections of the Connecticut Historical Society, vol. XX.] (Hartford, the Society, 1923, pp. xiv, 514. \$3.00.) The substantive part of the *Huntington Papers*, constituting the twentieth volume of the *Collections* of the Connecticut Historical Society, is the series of comments scattered through the letters of Brigadier-General Jedediah Huntington and of his brothers Joshua, Andrew, and Ebenezer on the general situation in the army and elsewhere during the years 1775 to 1782. Some useful information is given regarding Connecticut's trade before and after the war, for the Huntingtons were merchants in Norwich, and regarding supplies for the army and navy, for Joshua and Andrew acted in the capacity of commissaries at various times; but that for which this portly volume will be chiefly valued is the light which it throws on the state of mind of a group of high-minded, loyal, God-fearing, Connecticut men, one of whom, Jedediah, was in active service throughout the entire war.

and in his letters to his father and brothers expressed his opinion with considerable freedom. There is no opportunity here, in the limited space allotted to this notice, to cite from these letters what Jedediah called "a heap of indigested thoughts for your speculation". These thoughts consist of complaints about Congress, execration of the money situation, condemnation of the profiteers, comments on the condition of the army at Peekskill, Morristown, and Valley Forge, friendly sentiments regarding the French, expressions of longing for the end of the war, and remarks about deserters, Tories, inoculation, and the like. Two citations must suffice:

Did the Present Situation of Affairs [writes Ebenezer, in January, 1780] Admit of my Resigning, I would do it, nor a Moment longer wear a Constitution, already too much worn for an Ungrateful Country, who by their Conduct deserve to be Slaves to British Masters.

The abominable Pride [of the Peace Commissioners, says Jedediah in 1778] will carry them to demand greater terms than we can allow and to insist on them till we shall deny the less. They never could bear to think us upon any Equality with them, they know they cant subdue us. They cant love us, it is not in their Nature. They will, I fancy, after a few frivolous hopeless Attempts towards a Reconciliation leave us to ourselves.

The volume is well edited by Mr. Edward Gray of Milton, who contributed the Joshua series, and by Mr. Bates, who furnished the letters of Jedediah from the collections of the society. We wish that Mr. Bates had given us a note on the Dr. Church who turned Tory in 1775 (pp. 242-243), and we should like to call his attention to an error in spelling in the foot-note on page 19, to an error in date in the foot-note on page 268, and to a wrong letter-heading and running-title on pp. 262-263.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Saint Ferdinand de Florissant: the Story of an Ancient Parish. By Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J. (Chicago, Loyola University Press, 1923, pp. 271, \$1.50.) The Jesuit Fathers of St. Louis University have within the last decade developed a genuine interest in local history, and many carefully prepared studies of phases of Catholic history have been published by them or their scholars—therefore by noting the author, one could almost say without examination that the present study by Father Garraghan, *Saint Ferdinand de Florissant*, was well done. An examination of the appendixes proves that he has employed his usual patience in the study of sources, among which are many documents practically unused by former students.

No attempt has been made to prove anything new or to advance any new theories in regard to this early Missouri settlement. The book is simply, as asserted, the *Story of an Ancient Parish*. In fact, the Reverend Mr. Garraghan is very careful to mention the distinction between statements of fact and what is conjecture. However, upon several points

of dispute in regard to this village, the Reverend Mr. Garraghan does express definite opinions. Thus Florissant was never of equal or greater importance than St. Louis, nor was St. Louis dependent to any great extent upon Florissant for supplies. The reviewer thinks there is sufficient evidence to show that very probably St. Louis did obtain bread supplies from this smaller village located in a rich grain district. The author thinks also there is no evidence of a connection between the origin of Florissant and the Spanish fort Don Carlos el Principe.

Only the first three chapters are given to the description of the village itself. In chapters IV. and VI. is a discussion of the religious life under the first priests. Three chapters are devoted to the biographies of Father Joseph Marie Dunand, Father Charles de la Croix, and Father Charles F. Van Quickenborne. The book closes with a general discussion of the Jesuit ministry in Florissant. Carefully prepared appendixes and an index complete the work.

ADDRESS HEAD ALVORD.

Indian and White in the Northwest: a History of Catholicity in Montana, 1831 to 1891. By L. B. Palladino, S.J., with an introduction by Right Reverend John B. Brondel, D.D., first Bishop of Helena. Second edition, revised and enlarged. (Lancaster, Pa., Wickersham Publishing Company, 1922, pp. xx, 512, \$5.35.) This revised edition of Father Palladino's study of Roman Catholic missions in Montana does not advance the history of that spiritual activity beyond its first three score of years to 1891. This is the period covered in the original edition, long since out of print. Although presented in new form, this "re-writing" follows in most part the general outline of the original edition, with only a few corrections and additions.

The problem of the Indian delegation of 1831 is examined somewhat more carefully than in the first edition, but the evidence advanced to identify this deputation with the Flatheads rather than the Nez Percés is not convincing.

The not too friendly attitude toward Protestant missionary activity among the Indians of the Northwest, which marked the first edition, is preserved with only a slight softening down. It is only fair to say, however, that whatever *parti pris* is manifested can easily be matched in "official" Protestant narratives dealing with the same subject.

As a well-proportioned record of sacrificial devotion to the cause of Christian missions, Father Palladino's volume may serve as a guide to other sects in other states. Very much remains to be done in the study of the religious history of the West, but the record of the first half-century of the Roman Catholic Church in Montana has been satisfactorily compiled.

H. C. DALE.

The Life of an American Sailor: Rear Admiral William Hemsley Emory, United States Navy, from his Letters and Memoirs. Edited by Rear Admiral Albert Gleaves, U. S. N., LL.D. (New York, George H. Doran Company, 1923, pp. 359, \$4.00.) Gleaves's *Life of Rear-Admiral Emory* might have been compressed without serious loss into half the number of pages. It is made up of Emory's official correspondence, his letters to his wife, etc. The style both of the letters and of the editor's running comments is interesting. But there is included considerable matter that is trivial and discursive, whole chapters dealing with invitations to dinner and other entertainments and a half-dozen pages being given to the escapades of Emory's fox terrier.

Fate did not give to Emory the chance in a great crisis to command ship or fleet. Born in 1846, he was at the Naval Academy in time to take part, in a midshipmen's cruise, in a futile hunt for the Confederate cruiser *Tacony*. In this way he got a taste of war, which was to be the last until 1898. In 1884 Emory, in command of the U. S. S. *Bear*, accompanied the Greely Relief Expedition under Schley; and in the next seven years he made several more cruises to the Arctic regions, to protect American whalers and the seal fisheries and to prevent depredations of the Indians on the settlers of Alaska. From there he proceeded in the *Petrel* in 1894 to Yinkow to safeguard the interests of Americans during the Chino-Japanese War. During the Spanish War Captain Emory, in command of the *Yosemite*, served on the blockade of Cuba and Porto Rico. Chapters XXIII. and XXIV. show us Emory in command of the Second Division, forming part of the "battleship fleet" which President Roosevelt sent round the Horn to Japan in 1908. Before the fleet ended its itinerary Emory retired for age.

Admiral Emory was a gallant officer and a seaman of the first order. Of his personal courage the chapters on his Arctic cruises give convincing evidence. He was a society man, a type of officer chosen to grace gold-lace occasions like a queen's "Jubilee". In summing up his character, Admiral Gleaves says that while "he never invented anything" and "did not do any 'constructive work' . . . he left behind him an example of marked efficiency and of unselfish devotion to his profession".

H. F. KRAFFT.

The Red Cross in Iowa. By Earl S. Fullbrook. In two volumes. [Chronicles of the World War, edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh.] (Iowa City, Iowa, State Historical Society of Iowa, 1922, pp. xvi, 269; xii, 269.) The reader may be somewhat surprised to find that the first three chapters of a book so named are devoted to a condensed history of the international Red Cross and the organization and aims of the American Red Cross prior to April, 1917. The plan becomes not only clear but admirable, however, as the different divisions of the subject are reached. Under each head the national situation and results desired are

shown briefly, then the portion allotted to the Central Division, and finally, in greater detail, how Iowa carried out its share of the programme. The topics taken up in this way are: (1) creation of interest in the Red Cross and its organization in the state, (2) membership, (3) finances, national and local, (4) production of supplies, (5) canteen, home, camp, and nursing, services, (6) the Junior Red Cross. The result is that, instead of giving a rather meaningless cross-section, these volumes show the people of Iowa as part of a great national organization, eager to do their full share of its work.

In his preface Mr. Fullbrook notes how scanty are the contemporary records of the Sanitary Commission, and "Hence the Red Cross had to work out many of the problems anew", and he suggests that such a study as this, made now, "may be of special value sometime in the future". Any book about relief work in the Great War loses a part of its reason for being if it does not include a frank statement of difficulties encountered. There can be no doubt that such an honest presentation of the reasons for the slow development of Home Service work in rural problems of organization as is found in chapter IV., or the analysis of communities, or the discussion of methods of raising national quotas and local funds, will be of practical value at any time that like endeavor again becomes necessary. While substantiating figures and annotations are duly given, and mention made of many of the citizens who were responsible for Red Cross achievement in Iowa, yet the whole presentation of the subject is such that the book will be of interest to those who have no close connection with that state.

SHIRLEY FARR.

Land Settlement in Upper Canada, 1783-1840. By Gilbert C. Paterson, M.A. Introduction by Alexander Fraser, Ontario Archivist. [Sixteenth Report of the Department of Archives for the Province of Ontario, 1920.] (Toronto, Clarkson W. James, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1921, pp. xix, 278.) This account of British land policy in Ontario before the introduction of self-government confirms anew the theory that the disposal of public lands in a new country has more influence on the prosperity of the people than any other branch of government. Mr. Paterson has here set forth the various defects that made the British system a failure, in striking contrast to the successful United States methods in the same period. This failure was due chiefly to three policies on the part of the home government: the determination to make the land pay all costs connected with its administration; lavish grants in reward to Loyalists, soldiers, and civil officials; and the locking up of large areas as reserves for the crown and Protestant clergy. These practices produced a crop of evils that retarded the growth of the province and created political discontent. Settlement duties were evaded and huge tracts were held out of use for speculation or for the crown. In

1789 the home government considered the system of crown reserves "a measure which, if it had been adopted when the Old Colonies were first settled, would have retained them to this hour in obedience and loyalty" (p. 38); but Lord Durham later on pronounced the system "the most mischievous practical cause of dissension" existing (p. 206). Wild land became the bane of the province (p. 239). By 1840, sixteen-seventeenths of the public domain had been alienated but only one-tenth had been occupied. Contrary to custom in new countries, land companies played practically no part in Ontario's development. One of the lessons from Canada's experience emphasized by Mr. Paterson is the economic futility of land grants as a reward for military service. A careful bibliography and index and a series of maps make the work useful to the investigator.

AMELIA C. FORD.

COMMUNICATION

BIG RAPIDS, MICH.

The Editor of the American Historical Review:

Dear Sir:

I should esteem it a favor if you would allow me to correct a statement contained in the review of my book, *The Founding of the Roman Empire*, which appeared in your July number. Professor McFayden therein says that one of my main contributions, discussed in a careful appendix, is "that Caesar's Gallic command began on March 1, 59 B.C.". As it stands that is quite misleading. I did not discuss the date at which Caesar's command began at all but assumed it as a point about which there was no serious controversy. Practically all historians are agreed that it began on the date mentioned. I am sure that Professor McFayden cannot have meant what his review appears to say, namely, that I have discussed this matter carefully and that he regards the establishment of a commonly accepted date as a contribution. I suppose that what he intended was a reference to my discussion of the Vatinian Law, which is concerned, not with the date at which Caesar's proconsulship began, but with the reason why it was made to begin a full year before he started for his province.

I would like to add that one or two of the "acute observations" credited to me are not wholly original nor did I have any intention of making them appear so. One of them, namely, "under the Marian system it required a popular leader to create an army", is something that I did not say and to which I could only agree if it were much qualified.

Very sincerely yours,
FRANK B. MARSH.

[The editor has received from the reviewer a note acquiescing in the correction made by Professor Marsh.]

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The thirty-eighth annual meeting of the American Historical Association will be held in Columbus, December 27-29. The chairman of the programme committee is Professor Elbert J. Benton, Western Reserve University, Cleveland; of the committee on local arrangements, Professor Wilbur H. Siebert, Ohio State University, Columbus. The first sessions will be held on Thursday morning, beginning at ten o'clock. On the preceding evening the Mississippi Valley Historical Association will have a dinner conference with an attractive programme upon the westward movement in American history. It is expected that the morning hours will be occupied by sectional conferences, the afternoons and evenings by general sessions of the association as a whole. One of the three forenoons will have a conference on the cultural and political influence of missions in Western Europe, Turkey, China, and North America, a conference on modern European history, and one upon the social history of the American Revolution. Another day will open with conferences on English history, recent American history, and agricultural history. On the remaining day the conferences will comprise one on American diplomatic relations at the close of the eighteenth century, the usual conference of the historical societies, and one on medieval history. The presidential address of Professor Cheyney, together with that of President Garfield of the Political Science Association, is assigned to Thursday evening, the business meeting to Friday afternoon. For the other general sessions the following subjects have been tentatively assigned places: the social sciences in the school curriculum, legal history, recent diplomatic history of Europe, and the centennial of the Monroe Declaration. Some phases of history which have been given prominence in other years have been of necessity omitted, in order to avoid a congested programme. It has seemed best to bring in some new subjects, to encourage the development of new fields of historical research. The number of sessions or conferences devoted to various aspects or periods of American history may seem large, but we are informed that for those sessions ten papers were available for every one that could be used.

Plans are being made for general and group luncheons and dinners and other social occasions. On Thursday there will be a joint luncheon conference with the National Council for the Social Sciences and the Political Science Association, with an appropriate programme. On Saturday the patriotic societies will hold a luncheon conference. For one of the evenings the Agricultural History Society plans a dinner conference. It is probable that one day's sessions will be held at the State University;

most of the other sessions will be held in the Hotel Deshler, the headquarters of the Association in Columbus.

PERSONAL

Dr. William R. Thayer, president of the American Historical Association during the two years 1918 and 1919, died at Cambridge, Mass., on September 7, at the age of sixty-four. He was graduated from Harvard College in 1881, a classmate of Theodore Roosevelt, of whom he wrote an intimate biography published in 1919. A faithful Harvard man, he was for twenty-three years editor of the *Harvard Graduates Magazine*, and for nine years an overseer of the university. His chief fame as an historian rested upon *The Dawn of Italian Independence* (1893) and his admirable *Life and Times of Cavour* (1911), which won him Italian royal decorations and many other honors. He also prepared the *Life and Letters of John Hay* (1915). Mr. Thayer was a writer of great talent, with special gifts for biography, and did much useful service to the historical profession by protesting against such cultivation of mere learning as closes the mind to the claims of history as literature. He was a genial friend and an interesting companion.

Professor Louis Leger of the Collège de France died in Paris on May 2, aged eighty years. He was for many years the recognized authority in France on Slavic history, in which field he published numerous monographs. His best known work is his *Histoire de l'Autriche-Hongrie* (1879), which has passed through many editions and often been translated. The Slavic peoples of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy were the subject of his most especial interest and of his most important writings.

Benjamin Sulte of Ottawa, dean of French-Canadian historical writers, died on August 6, at the age of nearly eighty-two. He was for more than thirty years in the public service of the Dominion, and at one time president of the Royal Society of Canada. His *Histoire des Canadiens-Français*, 8 vols. (1882-1884), and *Histoire de la Milice Canadienne-Française* (1897) are probably his best known works. Six volumes of his collected essays, *Mélanges Historiques*, were published in 1918-1920.

Mr. John P. Davison of Tufts College has this autumn become assistant professor of history in Middlebury College, Vermont.

Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes, former professor of the history of thought and culture in Clark University, has become a professor of economics and sociology in Smith College.

Dr. John W. Oliver, hitherto director of the Indiana Historical Commission, has become professor of history, and head of that department, in the University of Pittsburgh.

Dr. Dumas Malone, formerly assistant professor of history in Yale University, has become associate professor of history in the University of Virginia.

Mr. Milton S. Cushman, hitherto professor of history in Sterling College, Kansas, has become professor of history and sociology in the Concord State Normal School at Athens, West Virginia. He will be succeeded in Sterling College by Mr. E. J. James of Chicago.

Professors B. B. Kendrick of Columbia University, A. M. Arnett of Furman University, and C. D. Johns of the University of Cincinnati have been appointed professors of history in the North Carolina College for Women.

Professor E. M. Violette of the State Normal College at Kirksville, Mo., has been appointed professor of history in the Louisiana State University, and Professor G. G. Andrews, who last year was an assistant professor at Cornell University, goes to Kirksville as professor of history.

Clyde L. Grose of Northwestern University has been promoted from assistant to associate professor of European history and has also been given leave of absence during the first semester, which he will spend in research in London and Paris.

Professor Randolph G. Adams of Trinity College, Durham, North Carolina, has accepted an appointment as librarian of the William L. Clements Library of Americana of the University of Michigan.

Professor C. W. Alvord has resigned his professorship in history at the University of Minnesota. He expects to reside abroad for the next few years, engaged in research and writing.

Dr. Earle D. Ross, formerly of the North Dakota Agricultural College, has been appointed associate professor of history in the Iowa State College of Agriculture, succeeding there Professor Albert B. Moore, who becomes head of the department of history in the University of Alabama.

Mr. Thomas P. Martin, formerly of the University of Louisville, goes to the University of Texas as associate professor of history. The following promotions in the latter university are noted: T. W. Riker, from an associate professorship to a professorship; M. B. Gutsch, C. W. Hackett, and F. B. Marsh, from adjunct to associate professorships.

Professors Henry S. Lucas of the University of Washington and Ulrich B. Phillips of the University of Michigan will teach at the University of California during the present year, the former during the first semester and the latter during the second.

GENERAL

We observe that Dr. Haskins's presidential address, "European History and American Historians", published as an article in our January number, appears in Spanish translation in the July number of *Inter-América*.

The First Loubat Prize of \$1000, given at the close of every quinquennial period, for the best work printed and published in the English

language, on the history, etc., of North America, has been awarded to Dr. Justin H. Smith, for his book on *The War With Mexico*.

A permanent record of the international historical congress held at Brussels in April has been compiled and published by MM. Des Marez and Ganshof, secretaries of the Belgian committee of organization: *Compte Rendu du 1^e Congrès International des Sciences Historiques, Bruxelles 1923* (Brussels, Imp. M. Weissenbruch, 1923, pp. 552). The volume contains Professor Henri Pirenne's address delivered at the opening session, the summaries of the papers read in the general meetings and in the sessions of the various sections, with indications, so far as possible, as to where they are to be published, an account of the numerous excursions, and the final list of members, containing 1026 names.

The third Anglo-American Historical Conference was held in London at the Institute of Historical Research of the University of London on July 6-7. The three sessions were attended by about seventy-five scholars, of whom some twenty were Americans. The first session was devoted to a discussion of the bibliography of modern English history which has been in preparation by a committee of the American Historical Association co-operating with a committee of British scholars organized by the late Sir George Prothero. The second session was devoted to a paper by Mr. J. P. Gilson, keeper of manuscripts of the British Museum, on Homes and Migrations of Historical Manuscripts, which will be printed in the *Bulletin* of the Institute of Historical Research. Upon the suggestion of American members of the conference it was voted to request the Anglo-American Historical Committee "to enter into communication with the Historical Manuscripts Commission of the American Historical Association with a view to arranging joint action for the tracing of historical manuscripts that pass out of the hands of their original owners"—with a view especially to keeping American scholars informed respecting the acquisition of foreign manuscripts by American institutions and collectors and to inform foreign scholars as to the American location of manuscripts formerly belonging in their respective countries. The third session was devoted to a paper by Dr. George M. Trevelyan on the Relation of Literature and History, which will be printed in a forthcoming number of *History*. At the meeting of the Anglo-American Historical Committee which preceded the conference it was decided to appoint a sub-committee, British and American, Mr. W. Foster convener, on the editing of modern historical documents, Mr. A. G. Little's sub-committee having confined itself practically to medieval texts.

The Czechoslovak government has provided scholarships (of \$500) in Slavic history and literature for the year 1923-1924 for five American students, who will study at the University of Prague.

On p. 784 of our last number mention was made of the series of volumes, *The History of Civilization*, mainly translations of M. Henri Berr's *L'Évolution de l'Humanité*, to be published by Messrs. George Routledge

of London. It may be added that the publication of this series in the United States has been undertaken by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

No. 1 of the new *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* of the University of London (Longmans) contains the Report on Editing Historical Documents, prepared by a committee of which Mr. A. G. Little is chairman. The code, more strict in its requirements than most of the similar codes prepared in other countries, deserves great attention on the part of historical editors. Made by a committee consisting chiefly of medievalists, it seems much more applicable to medieval than to modern texts, though nothing indicates that it is not intended for both.

The July number of the *Catholic Historical Review* has a paper on Mystic Life and Mystic Speculation in the Heart of the Middle Ages, by Professor Maurice De Wulf of Harvard; one on Erasmus, by Maurice Wilkinson of London; and one on Regulars and Their Appropriated Churches in Medieval England, by Egerton Beck of London.

The July number of the *Journal of Negro History* has a valuable article by T. R. Davis of Walden College, Nashville, on Negro Servitude (as distinguished from, and preceding, negro slavery) in the United States; a discourse entitled Three Elements of African Culture (referring to evolution in ethics, art, and government), by G. B. Hancock; a useful paper on Methodism and the Negro in the United States, by J. C. Hartzell; and a group of Notes on the Slave in Nouvelle-France, by Justice W. R. Riddell of Toronto. Early days of Wilberforce University are illustrated by a striking document.

Professor R. Redslob of the University of Strasbourg has written a *Histoire des Grands Principes du Droit des Gens depuis l'Antiquité jusqu'à la Veille de la Grande Guerre* (Paris, Rousseau, 1923, pp. 606).

To *The Making of the Western Mind: a Short Survey of European Culture* (London, Methuen, 1923, pp. xiii, 353), by F. M. Stawell and F. S. Marvin, the latter has contributed only three of the chapters, though the work is compiled in his customary manner.

Under the auspices of the Institut d'Études Slaves, Professor Lubor Niederle of the University of Prague brings out, as vol. I. of a *Manuel d'Antiquité Slave* (Paris, Champion, 1923, pp. 248), a general treatise on the early history (to about A.D. 1000) of the Protoslaves and of all branches of the Slavic race, southern, western, and eastern. The author announces a second volume on *La Civilisation des Anciens Slaves*.

Federal and Unified Constitutions (Longmans), by Professor A. P. Newton, of the University of London, will contain a compilation of such constitutions, British and other, from the earliest Swiss confederation of the thirteenth century to the 1919 constitution of the German Reich.

K. Schottenloher's *Flugblatt und Zeitung: ein Wegweiser durch das Gedruckte Tagesschrifttum* (Berlin, Schmidt, 1922, pp. 555) is not a

bibliography but a guide to the use of pamphlets and newspapers as historical sources, and is of especial value with reference to pamphlet material for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Dr. Kaufmann Kohler, president emeritus of the Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati, in *Heaven and Hell in Comparative Religion* (Macmillan, pp. 158), develops his subject as exhibited in ancient Oriental and classical literature, in the apocalyptic literature of the Old and New Testaments, in rabbinic and Mohammedan literature, and especially in the *Divina Commedia*.

The Oxford University Press publishes the recent Bampton Lectures of Dr. Leighton Pullan, on *Religion since the Reformation*, dealing with both Catholic and Protestant developments on the Continent, in Great Britain, and in America.

Nationalism and Education since 1780, a social and political history of modern education, by E. H. Reisner, has been published by Macmillan (pp. 575).

Mr. E. Wyndham Hulme, formerly librarian of the British Patent Office and now reader in bibliography in the University of Cambridge, prints two lectures there delivered on *Statistical Bibliography in relation to Growth of Modern Civilization* (London, Grafton and Co., pp. 44 and tables).

The Anglo-Japanese Alliance (University of California Press, pp. 111) is a statement prepared for publication directly after the meeting of the Conference on Limitation of Armament and Pacific and Far Eastern Questions, by the competent hands of Professor Alfred L. P. Dennis, but withheld from publication at that time. It appears now just as it was written in October, 1921, but the Four-Power Treaty of Dec. 13, 1921, is added in an appendix, together with the three Anglo-Japanese treaties of 1902, 1905, and 1911. The history of those treaties, the workings and effects of the alliance in all their ramifications, and its relations to events of the World War and to the various interests of Japan, Great Britain, her Dominions, and the United States, are all studied with care and with firmness of grasp.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. W. Swain, *What is History?* (*Journal of Philosophy*, May 24, June 7, 21); H. R. Spencer, *International Politics and History* (*American Political Science Review*, August); J. de Morgan, *La Notion Innée du Progrès dans l'Esprit Humain* (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, XXXV.); A. F. Pollard, *History and Progress* (*History*, July); G. C. Field, *The Influence of Race in History and Politics* (*Hibbert Journal*, January); P. E. Braun, *Die Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Sonntagsruhe, ein Beitrag zur Soziologie des Arbeiterschutzes* (*Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, XVI. 3); A. W. Small, *Some Contributions to the History of Sociology*, I.-III. (*American Journal of Sociology*, January, May, July); Charles Borgeaud,

Federal Characteristics of the Swiss and American Unions (Constitutional Review, July); Hilary Jenkinson, *On Autographs* (History, July); J. T. Adams, *History and the Lower Criticism* (Atlantic Monthly, September).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General review: M. Lacroix, *Bulletin Bibliographique, 1919-1922* (Revue des Etudes Grecques, April, 1922).

Sir W. Flinders Petrie has a new work nearly ready with Messrs. Constable of London, entitled *Social Life in Ancient Egypt*, including chapters on the Administration, Rights and Wrongs, Private Life, Supplies and Commerce, and Constructions and Defences.

The official account of the discovery of the tomb of Tutankhamen, in two volumes, written by Mr. Howard Carter, will be published before long by Messrs. Cassell.

Die Assyriologie, 1914-1922: Wissenschaftliche Forschungsergebnisse in Bibliographischer Form, by Ernst F. Weidner (Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1922, pp. x, 192), lists, sometimes with brief comments, more than 1800 titles of books, pamphlets, and review articles published, in Germany and in other countries, between Aug. 1, 1914, and July 31, 1922, including in its field in addition to Assyria the neighboring peoples with whom the Assyrians were in contact, and also the various geographical, linguistic, and cultural topics as well as the history.

Excellence in both scholarship and insight marks Dr. Theodore H. Robinson's *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel* (London, Duckworth) as a first-rate addition to early Hebrew history.

A brief treatise on private correspondence in the non-literary papyri of Oxyrhynchus and its bearing on New Testament language and thought is *Light from Ancient Letters* (London, Allen and Unwin, pp. 189), by Henry G. Meechan.

The *Reallexikon der Indogermanischen Altertumskunde* (Berlin, de Gruyter, 1923, pp. x, 672), by Professor O. Schrader, will prove of great usefulness to many scholars.

The late Professor Léon Heuzey, of the École Nationale des Beaux-Arts, prepared before his death, on the basis of a long lifetime of archaeological researches and of studies made with the aid of living figures, a large book of 310 pages and 150 plates on the *Histoire du Costume Antique*, which will be of high authority (Paris, Champion).

Professor Felix Jacoby of Kiel has undertaken an edition of *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* which, it is expected, will extend to six volumes. The first volume bears the subtitle *Genealogie und Mythographie* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1923, pp. 536).

In the series of small volumes bearing the general title *Our Debt to Greece and Rome* (Boston, Marshall Jones Company), we are to expect

before long a volume on *Roman Poetry and its Influence upon European Culture* by Professor Paul Shorey of Chicago, and one on *Ancient and Modern Rome* by Comm. Rodolfo Lanciani.

A critical and interpretative study of Roman history during the period 87-84 B.C. is printed as a University of Chicago dissertation by Professor Harold Bennett of Lebanon Valley College under the title *Cinna and His Times* (Menasha, Wis., George Banta Publishing Co., pp. 72).

Dr. Bernard W. Henderson of Exeter College, Oxford, has made an important and interesting contribution to the history of the Roman Empire by a volume on *The Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian* (London, Methuen).

The complete works of the Emperor Julian, except those against the Christians, have been published by J. Bidez and F. Cumont under the title *Imp. Caesaris Flavii Claudi Juliani Epistulae Leges Poemata Fragmenta Varia* (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1922, pp. xxvi, 328).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Köster, *Zur Seefahrt der Alten Aegypter* (Zeitschrift für Agyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde, LVIII. 2); K. Sethe, *Zur Jahresrechnung des Neuen Reiches* (*ibid.*, LVIII. 1); J. de Morgan, *Des Origines des Sémites et de celles des Indo-Européens* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, XXXIV. 1); E. Howald, *Ionische Geschichtsschreibung* (Hermes, LVIII. 2); C. Dawson and A. Farquharson, *The Beginnings of Rome*, I. (Sociological Review, April); Donald McFayden, *The Rise of the Princeps' Jurisdiction within the City of Rome* (Washington University Studies, X. 2); M. P. Charlesworth, *Tiberius and the Death of Augustus* (American Journal of Philology, April); W. D. Gray, *The Founding of Aelia Capitolina and the Chronology of the Jewish War under Hadrian* (American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, July).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Professor H. Grégoire of the University of Brussels has issued the first part of *Recueil des Inscriptions Grecques Chrétiniennes d'Asie Mineure* (Paris, Leroux, 1922, pp. iii, 128). The work is published under the auspices of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres. The second volume of Victor Schultze's *Altchristliche Städte und Landschaften* (Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1922, pp. xii, 477) takes up in turn the cities of Asia Minor and correlates conveniently the results of modern geographical and archaeological investigations.

A convenient contribution to the history of early Christian art in its various forms has been furnished by F. Grossi Gondi in *I Monumenti Cristiani Iconografici ed Architettonici dei Sei Primi Secoli* (Rome, Università Gregoriana, 1923, pp. xiv, 464).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

At the time of the meeting in Brussels of the Union Académique Internationale, April 16-18, its committee on the proposed dictionary of medieval (VI.-X. cent.) Latin held a session; it was resolved to publish periodically, at Paris, under the editorial care of the committee, a *Bulletin Du Cange*, devoted to the interests of the proposed lexicon and to contributions in its field. It is expected that the first number of the bulletin will appear before the next meeting of the committee, which will be held at Paris in January, 1924. The Italian portion of the work on the dictionary has been entrusted to the committee already organized for the *Supplementa Italica Glossariorum Ducangianorum* by the Istituto Veneto.

Recent issues in the series *Les Saints* (Paris, Gabalda) are a life of the founder of the Premonstratensian order, *Saint Norbert*, by E. Maire; *Saint Albert de Louvain, Evêque de Liège et Martyr*, by B. del Marmol; and *Saint Bonaventure*, by E. Clop. A more scholarly study of the career of the last named is *Vita di S. Bonaventura, Dottore Serafico: Contributo Storico alle Feste del VII. Centenario dalla sua Nascita* (Rome, Unione Arti Grafiche Abruzzesi, 1922, pp. 326) by D. M. Sparacio.

Among recent contributions to the ecclesiastical and religious history of the medieval period are *Die Teilnehmer an den Konzilien des Mittelalters* (Weimar, Böhlau, 1922, pp. iii, 232), by G. Tangl; *La Flagellation dans l'Histoire et les Tortures au Moyen Age* (Paris, Impr. et Libr. Artistique et Édition Parisienne Réunies, 1922, pp. 222), by T. Cudgel; and *Les Mystiques Bénédictins des Origines au XIII^e Siècle* (Paris, Lethielleux, 1922, pp. iv, 292), by Dom Besse.

The article on the Crusades in the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, by Ernest Barker, principal of King's College, London, has been made available in a small volume of 112 pages by the Oxford University Press.

A supplementary part has been issued to Marquis d'Albon's *Cartulaire Général de l'Ordre du Temple, 1119-1150* (Paris, Champion, 1922, pp. 135), which contains valuable indexes, including the identification of the place-names.

The seventh centenary of the deaths of the founders of the two great mendicant orders, Saint Dominic in 1221 and Saint Francis of Assisi in 1226, has called into existence two periodicals devoted to the history of the respective orders and their founders. Of *Il VII. Centenario di S. Domenico, Periodico Mensile Illustrato* (Bologna) twenty-four numbers were issued (1920-1922). *San Francesco di Assisi, Periodico Mensile Illustrato per il VII. Centenario della Morte del Santo, 1226-1926*, likewise began in 1920, and is expected to be continued until 1926 as a monthly publication issued at Assisi. The centenary of the death of Saint Dominic also called forth a volume of monographs entitled *Miscellanea Dominicana in Memoriam VII. Anni Sacularis ab Obitu Sancti Patris Dominici*,

1221-1921 (Rome, Ferrari, 1923, pp. xii, 292), and various other studies, of which *Der Hl. Dominikus: Untersuchungen und Texte* (Breslau, Aderholz, 1922, pp. xviii, 265), by B. Altaner, is worthy of special note because of its thoroughly critical study of the contemporary and early sources, and its inclusion of the texts of three of these sources.

Professor Alois Schulte of Bonn, for whom the Baden Historical Commission in 1900 published a notable history of medieval trade between western Germany and Italy, now puts forth, as the fruit of ten years of labor, in three volumes (the third consisting entirely of documents), a *Geschichte der Grossen Ravensburger Handelsgesellschaft* (Berlin, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt), a learned and interesting work, treating of the wide-spread activities of a great company centred in a small imperial city, and adding much to knowledge of medieval trade, and especially of medieval transportation.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Voltolini, *Prekarie und Benefizium* (Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XVI. 3).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

A. Rohde's *Die Geschichte der Wissenschaftlichen Instrumente vom Beginn der Renaissance bis zum Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, Klinkhardt and Biermann, 1923, pp. viii, 119) gathers a considerable amount of interesting material valuable for the history of science.

A. Büchi, whose edition of the first volume of the correspondence of the Cardinal of Sion (Switzerland) was noted in this journal (XXVI. 380), has now published *Kardinal Matthäus Schinner als Staatsmann und Kirchenfürst: ein Beitrag zur Allgemeinen und Schweizerischen Geschichte von der Wende des XV.-XVI. Jahrhunderts* (Zürich, Seldwyla, 1923, pp. xxiv, 396).

In the *Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, fasc. 120 is a very carefully documented account of *La Politique de St. Pie V. en France, 1566-1572* (Paris, Boccard, pp. viii, 203), by M. Charles Hirschauer, librarian of Versailles. The work rests on extensive researches in the Vatican archives and in other archives of Italy and France. The second half of the book is occupied with texts or summaries of some eighty documents, chiefly correspondence of the nuncio Frangipani in 1570 and 1571.

Among the manuscripts of the house of Fugger, now in the Austrian National Library at Vienna, are several volumes of news-letters, professional and private, collected by Count Philipp Fugger in the latter part of the sixteenth century. Out of these materials, highly interesting to the student of the public history and the private manners of the time, a volume has been made by Viktor Klarwill, *Fugger-Zeitungen: Ungedruckte Briefe an das Haus Fugger aus den Jahren 1568-1605* (Vienna, Rikola).

R. Pommepy has undertaken to give an account of *Les Compagnies Privilégiées de Commerce de 1715 à 1770* (Bordeaux, Cadoret, 1922, pp. 176).

The third and fourth volumes of F. Mauthner's *Der Atheismus und seine Geschichte im Abendlande* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1923) deal with the period of the enlightenment and of the French Revolution, giving special attention to France and Germany.

O. P. Gilbert has written *Vie du Feld-Maréchal Prince de Ligne* (Paris, Aveline, 1922), whose conspicuous rather than great career in the Austrian service ended during the Congress of Vienna.

Recent studies in the diplomatic history of the nineteenth century include *Le Vice des Coalitions: Études sur le Haut Commandement en Crimée* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1923, pp. 128), by J. Revol; *Il Principe Napoleone nel Risorgimento Italiano con oltre Cento Documenti Inediti Annotati* (Milan, Treves, 1922, pp. xii, 360), by A. Comandini; and *England und der Deutsch-Französische Krieg 1870-71: ein Beitrag zur Englischen Politik in der Zeit des Überganges vom Manchesterstum zum Imperialismus* (Bonn, Schroeder, 1923, pp. xv, 195), by K. Rheindorf. The thirteenth volume (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1922, pp. 436) of *Les Origines Diplomatiques de la Guerre de 1870-1871* includes documents to the close of the year 1866.

E. Murken is the author of a history of *Die Grossen Transatlantischen Linienreederei-Verbände, Pools, und Interessengemeinschaften bis zum Ausbruch des Weltkrieges: ihre Entstehung, Organisation, und Wirksamkeit* (Jena, Fischer, pp. x, 741).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. L. Hoskins, *The Growth of the Interest in the Route to India* (Journal of Indian History, June); A. A. van Schelven, *Engelsch Independentisme en Hollandsch Anabaptisme* (Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis, 1923); James Muilenburg, *The Embassy of Everaard van Weede, Lord of Dykvelt, to England in 1687* (University Studies, University of Nebraska, July–October, 1920); Sir Richard Lodge, *The So-called Treaty of Hanau of 1743* (English Historical Review, July); F. Charles-Roux, *La Turquie, les Mameluks, et la Première Occupation Anglaise en Égypte, 1801-1803* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, July); R. Kurt, *Der Belgisch-Französische Eisenbahnkonflikt und die Grossen Mächte, 1868-69: ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Krieges von 1870-71* (Deutsche Rundschau, May).

THE WORLD WAR

The British Stationery Office has published a *Select Analytical List of Books concerning the Great War* (pp. x, 431) by the late Sir George Prothero, containing about 8000 items, a list completer than any other in respect to English books, and otherwise particularly rich in the French.

A valuable group of essays on the origins of the war, by B. Dernburg, Freiherr von Schoen, L. Quessel, Count M. Montgelas, H. Delbrück, B. Schwertfeger, and others, edited by W. Ziegler, is published under the title *Deutschland und die Schuldfrage* (Berlin, Verlag für Politik und Wirtschaft, pp. 192).

Mr. Asquith, formerly prime minister of Great Britain, has just published in a volume, *The Genesis of the War* (New York, Doran), the articles which he has lately been contributing to the *Saturday Evening Post*.

Recent months have seen the production in Germany of an extensive literature on the antecedents and the immediate causes of the World War, with especial reference to the bearing upon the question of the guilt or innocence of Germany. Among the various books may be cited: *Die ersten Stundenschläge des Weltkrieges: eine Zeittafel der Wichtigen Vorgänge bei Kriegsausbruch mit Hinweisen auf die einschlägigen Urkunden* (Berlin, Vereinigung Wissenschaftlicher Verleger, 1922, pp. viii, 190), by B. W. von Bülow; *Bayerische Dokumente zum Kriegsausbruch und zum Versailler Schulspruch* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1922, pp. xix, 197), edited for the Bavarian Landtag by Pius Dirr; and *Der Zarismus und seine Bundesgenossen, 1914: Neue Beiträge zur Kriegsschuldfrage* (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft für Politik und Geschichte, 1923, pp. xii, 190), by F. Tönnies. In France several socialist books have also discussed the causes of the war in a way unfavorable to the actions of the Allied nations. As an illustration may be noted: *Les Responsables de la Guerre* (Paris, *L'Humanité*, 1921, vii, 510), by Alfred Pevet.

Among the French serial histories of the Great War that by A. Vialatte and M. Caudel entitled *La Vie Politique dans les Deux Mondes*, in its ninth volume (Paris, Alcan, 1922, pp. 435), is now complete to the armistice in 1918. The *Chronique de la Grande Guerre*, by Maurice Barrès, extends to Apr. 23, 1918, in the eleventh volume (Paris, Plon, 1923, pp. xi, 405). *La Grande Guerre sur le Front Occidental*, by General Palat, extends in the ninth volume (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1923, pp. 603) to December, 1915. The *Histoire de la Guerre par les Combattants*, edited by Paul Ginisty and Maurice Gagneur, in the fourth volume (Paris, Garnier, 1922, pp. 420) extends to the close of the war. The most important of the German serial histories of the war is *Der Grosse Krieg 1914-1918* (Leipzig, Barth), a co-operative enterprise, edited by Lieut.-Gen. M. Schwarte. This work is projected to extend to ten volumes, of about 600 pages each, of which the first three will deal with the campaigns in central Europe on both eastern and western fronts; the fourth volume with the war on the sea, in the colonies, and in Turkey, together with the air and gas fighting; the fifth volume will deal with the Austro-Hungarian campaigns; the sixth and seventh volumes, which are to be prepared by Professor Oncken, will treat of the diplomatic history of the war, and the three concluding volumes will deal with the matters of mili-

tary organization and strategy. Of this set the first, fourth, fifth, and eighth volumes have thus far appeared. A concise, single-volume history of the war is *Der Grosse Krieg 1914-1918* (Berlin, Hobbing, 1922, pp. 243), by E. O. Volkmann, an army officer assigned to archival service. The volume is already in its third edition and contains a considerable appendix of documents. Another convenient volume is Kurt Jagow's *Daten des Weltkrieges, Vorgeschichte und Verlauf bis Ende 1921* (Leipzig, Koehler, 1922, pp. 242).

The Irish Guards in the Great War, edited and compiled from their diaries and papers by Rudyard Kipling, is published in America by Doubleday, Page, and Company.

General A. Dubois in *Deux Années de Commandement sur le Front de France* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1921) deals with the history of the sixth French army during the first two years of the war when it was under his command. The work is a very distinct contribution both in its narrative and in its wealth of unpublished documents. Of a similar type is the work of General Tanant entitled *La III^e Armée dans la Bataille* (Paris, La Renaissance du Livre, 1923). Other accounts of episodes in the military operations which are definite contributions on their respective subjects are *La Défense de Liège, Namur, et Anvers en 1914* (Paris, Fournier, 1923, pp. 184), by Colonel Normand; *Contribution à l'Histoire de Charleroi: Joffre et Lanrezac* (Paris, Chiron, 1922, pp. 126), by J. Isaac; *La Bataille de Verdun* (*ibid.*, pp. 304), by J. Poirier; and *La Défense et la Victoire de Rheims* (Paris, Garnier, 1922, pp. xiv, 216), by H. Galli. *A Grande Guerra Universal de 1915 a 1918* (Paris, Jablonski, 1922, pp. xvii, 240), by Gen. José da Silva Braga, gives some account of the Portuguese participation in the war.

The naval history of the war is presented from the French side by Rear-Admiral Dumesnil in *Souvenirs de Guerre d'un Vieux Croiseur, 1914-1915* (Paris, Plon, 1922, pp. xi, 215); from the Italian side by R. Bernotti in *La Guerra Marittima* (vol. I., Florence, Carpignani and Zipoli, 1922); an episode on the German side is treated by Michel Farnaise in *L'Aventure du Goeben* (Paris, La Renaissance du Livre, 1923, pp. 270).

Du Vardar à la Sotcha (Paris, Bossard, 1923, pp. 352), by the late Professor Ernest Denis, is a collection of articles relating to the southern Slavs which appeared during the war. The importance of this collected edition of the papers lies mainly in the printing in full of the passages deleted from the original by the censor. X. Torau-Bayle, in *Salonique, Monastir, et Athènes* (Paris, Chiron, 1922, pp. ix, 136), criticizes severely the failure of the Allies to press the eastern campaign more aggressively and places the blame upon the British administration. The volume includes some new materials. In *Deutsche Streiter auf Heiligem Boden* (Oldenburg, Stalling, 1922, pp. 174) "Jildirim" Steuber has recited the

experiences and observations of a German military physician in the Turkish army. *Mit Feldmarschall von der Goltz Pascha in Mesopotamien und Persien* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1922, pp. 192), by H. von Kiesling, contains the recollections of one of the staff officers.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. de Lacroix, *Les I^e, II^e, III^e Armées à l'Aile Droite des Forces Allemandes en Août et Septembre 1914*, I., II. (*Revue des Sciences Politiques*, October, 1922, January); R. Evans, *The Strategy of the Campaign in Mesopotamia, 1914-1918* (*Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, May); Gen. E. Altham, *The Dardanelles Campaign* (*ibid.*); W. H. Johnson, *The Dardanelles Expedition* (*Coast Artillery Journal*, June); R. Fester, *Verantwortlichkeiten*, VII. *Ein Bismarckdenkmal der Novemberrevolution* (*Deutsche Rundschau*, June).

GREAT BRITAIN

One who wishes to read a distinctly German yet moderately expressed history of England in very brief compass may turn to the new (third) edition of Professor Lambert Gerber's small *Englische Geschichte*, in the *Sammlung Göschen* (Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 1923, pp. 180).

In the series of Lives of the Celtic Saints which the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is publishing the *Life of St. David* has been issued, edited by A. W. Wade-Evans and giving the sources in English with full introduction and notes (pp. xx, 124).

Professor Marc Bloch of Strasbourg has published in the *Analicta Bollandiana* (vol. XLI.) and separately (Brussels, 1923, pp. 123) *La Vie de S. Edouard le Confesseur par Osbert de Clare*, with a discussion of other early lives of the Confessor.

Students of British municipal history will remember the volume on *British Borough Charters, 1042-1216*, Latin texts and translations and introduction, published in 1913 by the late Adolphus Ballard. Professor James Tait has undertaken the task of completing the work by a volume extending to the beginning of the fourteenth century, which will be published by the Cambridge University Press before the end of the present year.

Miss Eleanor S. Rohde's *The Old English Herbals* (Longmans, pp. 243) contains, along with many chapters of great interest to the student of English ways, from Anglo-Saxon times down, chapters on the gardening aspects of the colonization of America by both Spaniards and Englishmen.

Corrodies in the English Monasteries, by Howard M. Stuckert, a doctoral thesis of the University of Pennsylvania (pp. 54), gives the history of the system of supplies of food, shelter, and sometimes clothing, which monasteries gave, in charity, or as a purchased annuity, to widows, widowers, old people, servants, and friends, or which they were compelled to pay to various persons as exactions by king or nobles. The origin of

the system, its various developments, its economic, legal, and social results, and its relation to the decline of the monasteries, are carefully studied.

In the series of *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History* (Oxford University Press), edited by Sir Paul Vinogradoff, Miss Bertha H. Putnam of Mount Holyoke College has a new volume on *The Practice of the Justices of the Peace in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, with appendixes including two of the original authorities on the subject, bearing date 1422 and 1503.

The last Raleigh Lecture on history, delivered before the British Academy last February, is a lecture on *National Policy and Naval Strength, XVIth to XXth Century*, by Rear-Admiral H. W. Richmond (Oxford University Press).

From a manuscript in the university library of Cambridge, hitherto unpublished, Major-Gen. R. H. Mahon publishes a vernacular composition which he attributes to George Buchanan, under the title *The Indictment of Mary Queen of Scots* (Cambridge University Press, pp. 54). Half the book is devoted to argument respecting the nature of the document and its relation to that which is called "The Book of Articles", presented to the English commissioners Dec. 6, 1568.

The Journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, from the beginning of the Long Parliament to the opening of the trial of Strafford, edited by Professor Wallace Notestein of Cornell University, a record hitherto unpublished, will be published this autumn by the Yale University Press.

Vol. IX. of the *Report on the Manuscripts of the Duke of Portland* (Historical Manuscripts Commission, pp. 434) calendars (in the main presents at full length) approximately equal bodies of documents from the letter-book of Sir John Holles, 1597-1616, a man much about the court of Elizabeth and James, and finally Earl of Clare, of letters from Copenhagen, mostly of 1704-1707, from James Vernon, envoy extraordinary there, and Charles Vernon, chargé d'affaires, and of letters to Harley from the Hague and Utrecht, written in 1711 and 1712 by the Earl of Strafford, ambassador there, and, with the Bishop of Bristol, representative of England in the making of the treaty of Utrecht. There is also a narrative protest of Captain William Kidd, Boston, July 7, 1699, much like his narrative already printed in *Commons Journal*, XIII. 31-32.

In vol. XLV. of the *Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria Signor Francesco Poggi* presented the texts of 118 letters written from London in 1670 and 1671 to the governors of the republic of Genoa by their consul, Carlo Ottone. Now, in vol. L., he continues this correspondence, rich in information on political, religious, military, naval, and commercial matters, through the year 1674, by the publication of 226 more letters, with an introduction on the Third Dutch War, and some use of the letters of Stefano d'Andrea, Genoese consul at Amsterdam (pp. lxx, 261).

The Manchester University Press (Longmans) will soon bring out *The Dutch Alliance and the War against French Trade, 1688-1697*, by Dr. G. N. Clark, fellow of Oriel College, and editor of the *English Historical Review*; and *The Principal Secretary of State*, by Dr. Florence M. G. Evans.

Vol. VIII. of the new series of the *Manuscripts of the House of Lords* (H. M. Stationery Office) covers the period of the first two sessions of the second Parliament of Great Britain, Nov. 16, 1708, to Apr. 5, 1710. The greater part of the volume is taken up with the papers laid before the House relating to the expedition fitted out by Louis XIV. with a view to establishing the Pretender on the throne of Scotland in 1708. Among other matters are some relating to the proceedings against Dr. Sacheverell and several judicial cases.

Lord Shaftesbury, by J. L. and Barbara Hammond (London, Constable) is an important addition to Professor Basil Williams's series of *Makers of the Nineteenth Century*.

Messrs. Longmans have in the press a history of *English Church Reform, 1815-1840*, by Dr. W. Law Mathieson.

The original series of the *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1907), edited by Dr. A. C. Benson and Lord Esher, closed with the death of the Prince Consort in December, 1861. A new series (Murray) covering about half the remainder of her reign, and edited by George E. Buckle, is in preparation.

The *Scottish Historical Review* for July has two articles of much importance in constitutional history, one on the General Council of the Estates, by Professor R. K. Hannay of Edinburgh, and the other on the Office of Sheriff in Scotland: its Origin and Early Development, by C. A. Malcolm.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Mabel H. Mills, *Adventus Vicecomitum, 1272-1307* (*English Historical Review*, July); W. F. Alexander, *Bishop's Courts under Elizabeth* (*Hibbert Journal*, July); P. Geyl, *Frederick Henry of Orange and King Charles I.* (*English Historical Review*, July); S. Helander, *Sir Josiah Child* (*Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, April).

IRELAND AND THE DOMINIONS

(For Canada, see p. 228; for India, see p. 215.)

Messrs. Longmans' announcements include a history of *The Revolution in Ireland, 1906-1923*, by Professor W. Alison Phillips of Trinity College, Dublin.

FRANCE

General reviews: H. Séé, *L'Évolution Commerciale et Industrielle de la France sous l'Ancien Régime: État des Travaux et Questions à Traiter* (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, XXXV.); P. Boissonade, *Les Études*

relatives à l'Histoire Économique de la Révolution Française, 1789-1804 (Paris, La Renaissance du Livre).

The Société de l'Histoire de France has lately issued vol. IV. of the *Dépêches des Ambassadeurs Milanais sous Louis XI.*, ed. de Mandrot and Samaran, and the *Mémoires Authentiques du Maréchal de Richelieu*, ed. de Boislisle, and has in the press or in preparation the second volume of the *Mémoires du Maréchal de Florange*, the fifth volume of the *Journal de Jean Vallier*, the twelfth volume of its edition of Froissart, and the sixth of its edition of the *Mémoires* of Cardinal Richelieu. Henceforth the society's publications are to be obtained from the publishing house of E. Champion.

The *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire Moderne* contains (February) "L'Introduction des Machines et le Travail des Enfants assistés dans les Manufactures", prepared by M. Weill-Gavel from notes left by the late Charles Ballot; (March) "Les Travaux du Comité des Garanties, institué par la Commission des Réparations, depuis sa création en mai 1921 jusqu'à la fin de l'année 1922", by M. Weill-Raynal; (May) "La Société Anglaise au XVIII^e Siècle et Hogarth", by M. A. Blum.

Among local monographs on prehistoric times in France are *La Touraine Préhistorique* (Paris, Champion, 1923, pp. 144), by Dr. L. Dubreuil-Chambardel; *Études Préhistoriques sur la Province du Perche* (Nogent-le-Rotrou, Hamard, 1923, pp. 290), by Dr. Jousset de Bellesme; *Le Roussillon Préhistorique* (Perpignan, Barrière, 1922, pp. 81), by P. Vidal; and *Les Origines de Nîmes, Époques Préhistorique et Protohistorique* (Nîmes, Gomès, 1923, pp. 175), by E. Gimon.

The seventh volume, *Avignon* (Valence, Imp. Valentinoise, 1921, pp. 1080), of *Gallia Christiana Novissima* has appeared under the editorship of Abbé U. Chevalier in continuation to the late J. H. Albanès.

The second fascicle of the late Professor Auguste Longnon's *Les Noms de Lieu de la France* (Paris, Champion) treats of the origin, meaning, and transformations of place-names of Saxon, Burgundian, Visigothic, Frankish, Scandinavian, Breton, and Basque origin.

The late Godefroid Kurth was able to complete a third, enlarged, and thoroughly revised edition of his masterpiece, *Clovis* (Brussels, Dewit, 1923, 2 vols., pp. xxviii, 384, 361).

The antagonist of Henry I. of England is the subject of a welcome biography, *Le Champion de la Normandie, Robert II. de Bellême et son Temps, 1056-1120* (Paris, Champion, 1923, pp. 288), by the Vicomte du Motey. Professor A. Cartellieri has completed his *Philip II. August, König von Frankreich* with a fourth volume in two parts (Leipzig, Dyk, 1921-1922, pp. x, 255; xvi, 721), dealing respectively with the struggle with John of England to 1206 and with the closing years of the reign from 1207 to 1223 with the battle of Bouvines as the central factor.

Emile Mâle, who is well known for his studies on French religious art in the thirteenth century, has now published an introductory volume entitled *L'Art Religieux au XII^e Siècle en France, Étude sur les Origines de l'Iconographie du Moyen Age* (Paris, Colin, 1922, pp. iv, 459).

The first volume of the *Recueil de Documents relatifs à l'Histoire des Monnaies Frappées par les Rois de France depuis Philippe II. jusqu'à François I^r*, by F. de Saulcy, was published in the *Collection de Documents Inédits*. The second, third, and fourth volumes were printed in the same form by the author himself and have recently been placed on sale with Champion of Paris.

Le Patriotisme Français de la Renaissance à la Révolution (Paris, Chiron, 1921, pp. 283), by Professor A. Aulard, is one of the latest evidences of his remarkable productivity.

In the series of *Manuels de Bibliographie Historique*, Professors E. Bourgeois and L. André have published the third volume, *Biographies*, of *Les Sources de l'Histoire de France, XVII^e Siècle, 1610-1715* (Paris, Picard, 1923, pp. xii, 372). The introduction contains a discussion of the historical value of the biographical writings produced in France in the seventeenth century. The material is divided into two chapters, one dealing with collected works (nos. 1295-1489) and the other with individual biographies (nos. 1490-1929), arranged alphabetically by the names of the persons. The publications listed are limited to those issued prior to 1715 and to such later works as were written by contemporaries of the seventeenth-century personages. The critical comments are full and excellent. The volume was ready for the press in 1914, but has been corrected up to 1922. The fourth volume, *Journaux et Pamphlets*, is announced to appear in November.

The thirty-fourth volume of the Boislisle and Lecestre edition of the *Mémoires* (Paris, Hachette, 1923) of Saint-Simon in the *Collection des Grands Écrivains de la France* is largely taken up with the résumé of the manuscript memoirs of the Marquis de Torcy dealing with diplomatic affairs.

Several contributions of a high grade of excellence have recently been made to the history of the eighteenth century and of the Revolution in the provinces: A. Leroux, *Étude Critique sur le Dix-huitième Siècle à Bordeaux* (Bordeaux, Bière, Feret et Fils, 1921, pp. xiii, 416); P. Pinsseau, *Gien sous l'Ancien Régime et la Révolution* (Orléans, Houzé, 1922, pp. 316); P. Montarlot, *Les Emigrés de Saône-et-Loire* (Autun, Taverne et Chaudioux, 1922, pp. 439); Mgr. C. Bellet, *Histoire de la Ville de Tain en Dauphiné*, vol. II., *Période Révolutionnaire* (Paris, Picard, 1922, pp. xii, 543); Dr. Madeleine Deries, *Le District de Saint-Lo pendant la Révolution* (*ibid.*, 1923, pp. xxxix, 515); and Dr. H. Pommeret, *L'Esprit Public dans le Département des Côtes-du-Nord pendant la Révolution, 1789-1799, Essai d'Histoire Politique d'un Département Breton* (Saint-Brieuc, Prud'homme, 1921, pp. xxiii, 523).

Of considerable value is the study of *Marie Antoinette et les Pamphlets Royalistes et Révolutionnaires, avec une Bibliographie de ces Pamphlets, les Amoureux de la Reine* (Tours, Arrault, 1921, pp. 428), by H. d'Almeras. *Les Agents Royalistes en France au Temps de la Révolution et de l'Empire, l'Affaire Perlet, Drames Policiers* (Paris, Perrin, 1922, pp. 328) is a characteristic production of G. Lenotre.

An index volume (Paris, Hachette, 1922, pp. 359) to Professor Lavis's *Histoire de France Contemporaine* has been issued.

Dr. K. J. Frederiks has collected in *Maximes de Napoléon* (the Hague, Nijhoff, 1922, pp. xxx, 125) over 400 quotations from the emperor's writings and utterances on political and administrative matters. The selections are carefully arranged topically and reference is made to the source in every case. The compiler's introduction is frankly laudatory of the political genius of Napoleon.

Professor A. Aulard has published the third volume (Paris, Noblet, 1923, pp. vi, 848) of *Paris sous le Premier Empire*, containing documents to the close of 1808; and E. d'Hauterive, the third volume (Paris, Perrin, 1922, pp. 599) of *La Police Secrète du Premier Empire, Bulletins Quotidiens adressés par Fouché à l'Empereur*, carrying the work to the close of 1807. Other publications on the Napoleonic period are *Le Général Jacob et l'Expédition de Bonaparte en Égypte, 1798-1801* (Bergerac, Castanet, 1921, pp. 151), by G. Homsy; and *Mémoires du Général Noguès sur les Guerres de l'Empire* (Paris, Lemerre, 1922, pp. 319), edited by Baron A. de Maricourt.

Light on the internal affairs of France during and since the Great War will be found in *Jaurès et le Parti de la Guerre* (Paris, Rieder, 1922, pp. 236), by F. Goutenoire de Toury; *La Politique Financière de la France pendant la Guerre, Août 1914-Novembre 1920* (Bordeaux, Delmas, 1922, pp. 358), by G. Charbonnet; *Les Finances de France* (Paris, Payot, 1921, pp. 384), by G. Bonnet and R. Auboin; *Les Chemins de Fer Français pendant la Guerre, Étude Historique, Économique, et Juridique* (Paris, Rousseau, 1922, pp. 254), by Dr. G. Lafon; *Loi du 17 Avril 1919 sur la Réparation des Dommages de Guerre* (Troyes, Grande Imprimerie, 1921, pp. 196), by Dr. L. Greninger. Various hitherto unpublished documents on post-war diplomatic affairs are contained in *La Politique Française* (Paris, Nouvelle Revue, 1922).

For the municipal history of France note may be made of *Arles Antique* (Paris, Boccard, 1922, pp. 426), by L. A. Constans; *L'Organisation Municipale de Perpignan du XII^e au XVIII^e Siècle* (Perpignan, Barrière, 1920, pp. 207), by H. Aragon, which includes numerous documents; *La Cité de Carcassonne, Histoire et Description des Origines jusqu'à l'Avènement des Comtes de la Maison de Barcelone, 1067* (Toulouse, Privat, 1922, pp. xxi, 336), by J. Poux; *Recueil de Documents concernant la Commune et la Ville de Poitiers* (vol. I., 1063-1327, Paris, Champion, 1923, pp. 390),

by E. Audoin, being vol. XLIV. of *Archives Historiques du Poitou; Bibliographie Lyonnaise, Recherches sur les Imprimeurs, Librairies, Relieurs, et Fondeurs de Lettres de Lyon au XVI^e Siècle* (Lyons, Rey, 1921, pp. 507), by Baudrier; and *La Juridiction Consulaire de Rouen, 1556-1791* (Rouen, Imp. de la Vicomté, 1922, pp. vii, 309), by H. Lafosse.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Bloch, *Le Capitulare de Villis* (*Revue Historique*, May-June); L. Bertrand, *Louis XIV.*, I-V. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, July 1-September 1); P. M. Bondois, *Colbert et la Question du Sucre, la Rivalité Franco-Hollandaise* (*Revue d'Histoire Économique et Sociale*, XI. 1); M. Peyre, *L'Établissement des Français en Corse, 1768-1789*, I. (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July); H. Sée, *La Mise en Valeur des Terres Incultes, Défrichements et Déséchements à la Fin de l'Ancien Régime* (*Revue d'Histoire Économique et Sociale*, XI. 1); A. Mathiez, *La Révolution et les Subsistances, la Fin des Enragés* (*Annales Révolutionnaires*, March); *id.*, *De la Véritable Nature de l'Opposition entre les Girondins et les Montagnards* (*ibid.*, May-June); A. Richard, *Marchena et les Girondins* (*ibid.*, March); F. Charles-Roux, *L'Expédition de Bonaparte en Égypte et la Politique Anglaise dans la Mer Rouge* (*Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises*, XV. 2); P. de la Gorce, *Le Concordat de 1801*, I., II. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, August 1, September 1); E. Le Marchand, *Un Concordat Oublié; le Concordat de 1817* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July); H. Tronchon, *Les Études Historiques et la Philosophie de l'Histoire aux Alentours de 1830* (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, XXXIV. 1); V. Demontès, *Un Essai de Protectorat Tunisien à Oran, 1831* (*Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises*, XV. 2); A. Arnauné, *Alexandre Ribot* (*Revue des Sciences Politiques*, January).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

General reviews: G. Bourgin, *Les Études relatives à la Période du Risorgimento en Italie* (Paris, Renaissance du Livre); P. Boissonade, *Les Études relatives à l'Histoire Économique de l'Espagne et leurs Résultats (-1453)*; Paris, *ibid.*.

Albert von Hofmann has written an historical geography of Italy arranged in chapters devoted to the various sections, supplemented by a general historical survey and various maps. The title of the work is *Das Land Italien und seine Geschichte, eine Historisch-Topographische Darstellung* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1922, pp. 450).

Much critical work of the first order has gone to the making of Monsignor Fr. Lanzoni's *Le Origini delle Diocesi Antiche d'Italia (Studi e Testi*, fasc. 35; Rome, Tipografia Vaticana, 1923, pp. 672), henceforward a corner-stone of early Italian ecclesiastical history.

A union of forces has taken place between the two chief Italian enterprises of publication of sources for medieval Italian history, the Istituto

Storico Italiano and the *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, in accordance with which Sig. V. Fiorini, director of the latter, will in general avoid hereafter the publication in the new Muratori of texts which do not appear in the old, while the institute (of which hereafter Sig. Fiorini will be a member) will in general not print texts which Muratori printed. The *Archivio Muratoriano* will be absorbed in the *Bollettino* of the institute.

By the liberality of the Florentine Chamber of Commerce, the ordinances of one of the chief of the medieval gilds of Florence have been published in an excellent edition by Signor Raffaello Ciasca, *Statuti dell' Arte dei Medici e Speziali* (Florence, A. Vallecchi, 1922, pp. xxviii, 677). This was Dante's gild.

For the history of the Renaissance in Italy, the following recent publications may be noted: G. Bohne's *Die Freiheitsstrafe in den Italienischen Stadtrechten des 12.-16. Jahrhunderts*, of which volume I. is entitled *Das Aufkommen der Freiheitsstrafe* (Leipzig, Weicher, 1922, pp. xxix, 279); V. F. Malaguzzi's *La Corte di Lodovico il Moro, le Arti Industriali, la Letteratura, la Musica* (Milan, Hoepli, 1923, pp. 326); and C. Ricci's *L'Architecture Italienne au XVI^e Siècle* (Paris, Hachette, 1923), a well illustrated account of Bramante, Michael Angelo, Raphael, Sansovino, and others.

Several general studies of the Risorgimento are among the new publications: G. D. Herron's *The Revival of Italy* (London, Allen and Unwin, 1922, pp. 128); M. Rosi's *Storia Contemporanea d'Italia* (Turin, Un. tip. Torinese, 1923, pp. 624); I. Raulich's *Storia del Risorgimento Politico d'Italia* (vols. II. and III., 1830-1848, Bologna, Zanichelli, 1923); and U. Pellegrini's *Il Risorgimento Economico dell'Italia dalla Costituzione del Regno al 1921* (Rome, Società Editrice Libr., 1922, pp. xv, 154).

Dr. George M. Trevelyan has a new work in his field of the Risorgimento coming out with Messrs. Longmans, entitled *Manin and the Venetian Revolution of 1848*.

A Swedish scholar, Professor Nils Åberg, of Upsala, is the author of *La Civilisation Énéolithique dans la Péninsule Ibérique* (Paris, Champion, 1923, pp. 204).

A. Ballesteros y Beretta has issued the third volume of his *Historia de España y de su Influencia en la Historia Universal* (Barcelona, 1922), and M. Gaibrois de Ballesteros the first volume of his *Historia del Reinado de Sancho IV. de Castilla* (Madrid, Impr. de Archivos, 1922, pp. ccii, 240).

Recent numbers of the *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla* (62-69) contain the continuations of Professor Germán Latorre's study of the struggle of Spain and Portugal in the Moluccas and of Fray P. N. Pérez's monograph on the members of the Order of Mercy who went to the New World. The installments of the *Catálogo de*

Legajos of the Archivo General de Indias having now reached the end of the third section, Casa de la Contratación, that portion of the catalogue can now be had in the form of two volumes, lacking only, at present, their table of contents. Fr. Pérez's monograph can now also be had as a volume, *Religiosos de la Merced que pasaron á la América Española, I. Siglo XVI.*

The Marquis Villa-Urrutia has promptly followed his biography of *Lucrecia Borja* (Madrid, Tip. Artística, 1922, pp. 238) by a study of *Fernando VII., Rey Constitucional. Historia Diplomática de España de 1820 á 1823* (Madrid, Beltrán, 1923, pp. 376).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. B. Picotti, *La Congiura dei Cardinali contro Leone X.* (*Rivista Storica Italiana*, July); A. C. Jemolo, *Il Giansenismo Italiano* (*ibid.*); A. Pingaud, *Le Premier Royaume d'Italie; le Développement du Système Napoléonien*, II. (*Revue des Études Napoléoniennes*, July); L. Salvatorelli, *L'Italia nella Politica Internazionale dell'Era Bismarckiana*, I. 1871-1875 (*Rivista Storica Italiana*, April); H. K. W. Kumm, *Ramon Lul* (*Princeton Theological Review*, April).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

Of the second edition of *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Deutschen Vorzeit* (Leipzig, Dyk, 1923) two volumes have recently appeared, one containing extracts from Ammianus Marcellinus translated and edited by W. Keeb, the other containing the register of Pope Innocent III. on imperial questions from 1198 to 1209 translated and edited by G. Tangl. A sixth edition of Gebhardt's *Handbuch der Deutschen Geschichte* is in process of preparation under the editorship of Professor Aloys Meister and a considerable group of leading German scholars. The first volume (Stuttgart, Union, 1922, pp. xvi, 798) has already appeared. Professor Dietrich Schäfer has issued a ninth revised edition of his *Deutsche Geschichte* (Jena, Fischer, 1922) with continuation to the present time.

Contributions to the institutional and constitutional history of Germany are contained in *Die Ministerialität in Brandenburg. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Ministerialität und zum Sachsen-Spiegel* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1922, pp. viii, 124), by George Winter; in the second, revised edition of Professor Georg von Below's *Territorium und Stadt. Aufsätze Deutschen Verfassungs-, Verwaltungs- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1923, pp. xii, 257); and in the second, revised edition of *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte vom 15. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1922, pp. vi, 205), by Fritz Hartung, which is published in the *Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft* edited by Professor Aloys Meister.

F. Philippi has begun the publication of an *Atlas zur Weltlichen Altertumskunde des Deutschen Mittelalters*, part I. (Bonn, Schroeder, 1923,

pp. 151), which is largely made up of unpublished materials drawn from the resources of various German libraries to illustrate the daily life of the people. Various phases of German medieval life are the subject of discussion in *Die Reiterei in den Germanischen und Fränkischen Heeren bis zum Ausgang der Deutschen Karolinger* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1922, pp. viii, 99), by Hans von Mangoldt-Gaudlitz; *Geschichte des Deutschen Städtewesens mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Mittelalters* (Bonn, Schroeder, 1922, pp. v, 155), by Paul Sander; *Alte Gewerbe und Gewerbegassen* (Würzburg, Memminger, 1921, pp. 354), by E. Volckmann; *Deutsche Kulturgeschichte in Lebensvollen Einzelbildern*, part II. (Stuttgart, Steinkopf, 1922, pp. 304), edited by Gustav von Schlipkötter and F. Pferdmenges; *Deutsch-Russische Handelsgeschichte des Mittelalters* (Lübeck, Waelde, 1922, pp. xvi, 572), published by Professor L. K. Goetz of Bonn in the *Hansische Geschichtsquellen*; and *Die Handels- und Schiffahrtsbeziehungen zwischen Lübeck und Finnland* (Jena, Fischer, 1923, pp. xix, 214) by Karl von Borries.

The critical portion of German history lying just after the death of Gustavus Adolphus is treated with great fullness and care by Dr. Johannes Kretzschmar, archivist of the state of Lübeck, in three volumes on *Der Heilbronner Bund, 1632-1635* (Lübeck, H. G. Rahtgens, 1922, pp. xxiii, 486, 620, 503, the last containing the notes).

Samuel von Pufendorf's *Ueber die Verfassung des Deutschen Reiches* (Berlin, Hobbing, 1922, pp. liii, 138), written under the name of Severinus von Monzambano, has been edited in German by Professor H. Bresslau.

Dr. Victor Loewe of Breslau has edited *Preussens Staatsverträge aus der Regierungszeit König Friedrichs I.* (Leipzig, Hirzel, 1923, pp. xii, 123) as the ninety-second volume of *Publikationen aus den Preussischen Staatsarchiven*.

Hermann Granier has edited *Prinzenbriefe aus den Freiheitskriegen, 1813-1815, Briefwechsel des Kronprinzen Friedrich Wilhelm (IV.) und des Prinzen Wilhelm (I.) von Preussen mit dem Prinzen Friedrich von Oranien* (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1923, pp. 220). *Wilhelms I. Briefe an seinen Vater König Friedrich Wilhelm III., 1827-1839* (Berlin, Curtius, 1922) have been edited by Paul Alfred Merbach; and the *Politische Schriften und Briefe* (Munich, Drei Masken Verlag, 1922, pp. xxxiv, 248) of General von Clausewitz, by H. von Rothfels. The eleventh and twelfth volumes of *Deutsche Geschichtsquellen des XIX. Jahrhunderts* contain the *Nachgelassene Briefe und Aufzeichnungen zur Geschichte der Jahre 1848-1853* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1922, pp. xii, 424) of Josef von Radowitz, edited by W. Möring; and *Politische Briefwechsel aus seinem Nachlass* (*ibid.*, 1923, pp. 500) of Max Duncker, ed. J. Schultze.

In *Mes Combats, à l'Assaut du Militarisme et de l'Impérialisme Allemand* (Strasbourg, Istra, 1922, pp. 310) Professor F. W. Förster of the University of Zürich reviews the history of German policy in the last

fifty years from the point of view of a sociologist. His attitude is one of severe condemnation of German policy in the past, but of hopefulness for the nation's future. Otto Hammann, who was publicity representative of Wilhelmstrasse, in *Bilder aus der Letzten Kaiserzeit* (Berlin, Hobbing, 1922, pp. 163), recounts anecdotes of many personages of national and international consequence during the reign of Wilhelm II. The *Erinnerungen des Kronprinzen Wilhelm, aus den Aufzeichnungen, Dokumenten, Tagebüchern, und Gesprächen* (*ibid.*, 1922, pp. 370), have been edited by K. Rosner.

Count Waldersee was Prussian military attaché in Paris before the war of 1870, *chargé des affaires* there after that war, deputy to Moltke later, then his successor as chief of staff. The two volumes (a third is promised) of the *Denkwürdigkeiten des Generalfeldmarschalls Alfred Grafen von Waldersee* (Stuttgart and Berlin, Deutscher Verlag), edited by H. O. Meisner, are based on diaries, letters, and fragmentary memoirs. They run to 1900, and contribute much that is interesting to the knowledge of William I., William II., Moltke, and Bismarck.

Recent events have given particular interest to the history of the Rhineland. On the German side there is *Geschichte des Rheinlandes von den Ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart* (Essen, Baedeker, 1922), by H. Aubin, T. Frings, and J. Hansen, while on the French side there is *La Rhénanie* (Paris, Alcan, 1922, pp. xvii, 175), by J. Baldensperger, J. Bardoux, and G. Blondel. A volume of *Geschichte der Rheinischen Städte* (Essen, Baedeker, 1922) is by Kuske.

The history of German towns has been enriched by R. Koebner in *Die Anfänge des Gemeinwesens der Stadt Köln, zur Entstehung und Ältesten Geschichte des Deutschen Städteswesens* (Bonn, Haustein, 1922, pp. xxiv, 606); in *Die Stadt Konstanz* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1922, pp. 176) by Albert von Hofmann; in the *Urkundenbuch der Stadt Heilbronn*, edited by M. von Rauch, of which the fourth volume (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1922) covers the years 1525-1532; and in *Geschichte der Stadt Hildesheim* (vol. I., Hildesheim, Lax, 1922) by Dr. Gebauer, the city archivist.

Dr. Hanns Schlitter, of the Austrian archives, adds greatly to our knowledge of the earliest days of the reign of Francis Joseph by his careful and well-documented study entitled *Versäumte Gelegenheiten: die Oktroyierte Verfassung vom 4. März 1849* (Vienna, Amalthea-Verlag, pp. 227).

A careful judicial account of *Le Comte d'Aehrenthal et la Politique de Violence* (Paris, Plon, 1922, pp. 306) by a neutral, Olof Hoijer, furnishes little new information, but is especially valuable for the full and careful account of the annexation of Bosnia. Events and conditions during the break-up of the Hapsburg empire are set forth in *L'Agonie d'un Empire: l'Autriche-Hongrie, Moeurs et Politique* (Paris, Perrin, 1923),

by André de Hevesy. The reaction from the rule of Bela Kun in Hungary is described by R. Tarcali in *Quand Horthy est Roi* (Paris, Astra, 1922, pp. 128). The account is distinctly hostile to the new régime, and gives particular emphasis to its anti-Semitic character.

The *Histoire du Canton de Fribourg* (Fribourg, Fragnière, 1922, pp. 638), by Professor G. Castella of that place, is, on the whole, more an account of the history of the city than of the canton. The materials have been carefully collected and well handled.

The history of the Society of Jesus in Switzerland in the first half of the nineteenth century is recounted by Father O. Pfülf of that order, in *Die Anfänge der Deutschen Provinz der neu entstandenen Gesellschaft Jesu und ihr Wirken in der Schweiz, 1805-1847* (Freiburg, Herder, 1922, pp. vii, 524).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. W. Thompson, *Crown Lands in Feudal Germany* (Journal of Political Economy, June); H. Grünfelder, *Die Färberei in Deutschland bis zum Jahre 1300* (Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XVI. 3); W. Lenel, *Der Konstanzer Frieden von 1833 und die Italienische Politik Friedrichs I.* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXVIII. 2); H. Grisar, *Lutheranakten*, VII. Zu Luthers Verbrennung der Bannbulle, 10 Dec. 1520 (Historisches Jahrbuch, XLII. 2); E. Laskine, *Le Droit Ecclésiastique Luthérien et la Formation de la Mentalité Étatiste en Allemagne* (Revue d'Histoire Économique et Sociale, XI. 1); Gabriel Hanotaux, *L'Allemagne d'Hier: le Premier Craquement de l'Empire*, 1917 (Revue des Deux Mondes, August 1).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

As a posthumous continuation of the series of volumes which formed the main work of the late Professor Paul Fredericq, friends have now published a volume, edited by him, entitled *Codex Documentorum Sacratissimarum Indulgenciarum Neerlandicarum: Verzameling van Stukken betreffende de Pauselijke Aflaten in de Nederlanden, 1300-1600* (the Hague, Nijhoff, 1922, pp. xiv, 694).

For several years before the World War, M. Henri Lonchay, charged with the task by the Belgian Commission Royale d'Histoire, had been preparing, at Simancas and at Brussels, a calendar of the correspondence of the Spanish court in the seventeenth century with its viceroys and other officials in the Low Countries, and of the *consultas* of the Spanish Council of State respecting Belgian affairs in that period. Just as the manuscript was being put in the printer's hands, the war began; and M. Lonchay died in 1918. Under the editorial care of M. Joseph Cuvelier, general archivist of the kingdom, the work has been carried on to the completion and publication of vol. I., a quarto of 647 pages, analyzing 1558 documents and illustrating with a wealth of material, carefully prepared, the period of Philip III. and the Archduke Albert, *Correspondance de la Cour d'Espagne*

sur les Affaires des Pays-Bas au XVII^e Siècle, I., 1598–1621 (Brussels, Imbrechts).

Les Lois sur la Mainmorte dans les Pays-Bas Catholiques, Étude sur l'Édit du 15 Septembre 1753, ses Précédents et son Exécution (Louvain, Smeesters, 1922, pp. xv, 287), by Dr. Richard Koerperich, not only covers the topics indicated by the title but also gives an account of the preceding legislation dealing with the group of questions of property involved. The author's investigations have been thorough; his ecclesiastical bias is frankly avowed in the introduction. Detailed studies of this sort are essential for a full understanding of the problem and for the formulation of correct policies; the edict studied is a single example of a considerable mass of legislation in the eighteenth century enacted not only by the more liberally minded enlightened despots but even by loyal Catholic monarchs.

M. Paul Verhaegen's *La Belgique sous la Domination Française, 1792–1814*, seems likely to furnish an exhaustive treatment of its subject (from a strongly anti-Revolutionary point of view), if one may judge from the first volume, *La Conquête, 1792–1795* (Brussels, Goemaere, 1922, pp. 670).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Letts, *Merchant Strangers at Bruges* (Contemporary Review, July).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

General review: Otto Forst-Battaglia, *Die Polnische Historiographie der Gegenwart, 1913–1917* (Mitteilungen des Instituts für Oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung, XXXIX. 1–2).

Professor Knut Gjerset, of Luther College, author of a well-known history of the Norwegian people, has in the press (Macmillan) *A History of Iceland*, from the period of colonization to the present, with due attention to cultural history, and to the early relations to America.

M. Maurice Paléologue, the last French ambassador to the tsar, in *Le Roman Tragique de l'Empereur Alexandre II.* (Paris, Plon, 1923, pp. 256), describes the relations of that tsar with the Princess Catherine Dolgoruki, his morganatic wife, and the movements in support of the liberal programme of Loris-Melikov, cut short by the emperor's assassination.

An account of the last forty years of Russian history will be found in A. von Hedenström's *Geschichte Russlands von 1878 bis 1918* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1922, pp. 352). The first volume (Berlin, Slowo, 1922, pp. xxx, 511) of the memoirs of Count Sergei Witte has been published in Russian.

Leon Trotsky's 1905 has been translated into French (Paris, *L'Humanité*, 1923) by Parijanine. The volume expounds the events of the first Russian revolution as the background for the revolution of 1917.

Messrs. Duckworth of London announce for publication this autumn a translation of the Russian correspondence already mentioned in these notes, *The Letters of the Czarina to the Czar, 1914-1916*, with an introduction by Professor Sir Bernard Pares.

Russland 1914-1917, Erinnerungen an Krieg und Revolution (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1922, pp. 264), by General Vassili Gurko, has been translated from the Russian by E. von Tettau, who has written a critique of it entitled *Der Böse Deutsche, eine Auseinandersetzung mit General Gurkos Kriegswerk: Russland 1914-1917* (Berlin, Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1922, pp. 67). Other translated memoirs of the revolution by adherents of the old régime are *Die Russische März-Revolution 1917, Erinnerungen* (Munich, Drei Masken Verlag, 1922, pp. 114), by J. Lomonossov, and *Souvenirs de Russie, 1916-1919* (Paris, Plon, 1923, pp. v, 315), by Princesse Paley, which is already in its thirteenth edition.

Recent German relations with Russia are explained by R. Pohle in *Russland und das Deutsche Reich* (Bonn, Schroeder, 1922, pp. viii, 142). R. Wingedorf gives an account of *Die Vernichtung der Deutschen Presse in Polen* (Danzig, Brücken-Verlag, 1921). The boundary dispute between Poland and Lithuania is set forth with careful reference to the historical background in *Vilna et le Problème de l'Est Européen* (Paris, Bossard, 1922, pp. 130), by G. Moresthe. A similar thorough study of *La Question des Iles d'Aland de 1914 à 1920* (Helsingfors, Imp. du Gouvernement, 1921, pp. 201) is by J. R. Danielson-Kalmari.

The revolutionary movement in the region of the Caucasus furnishes the subject of *Les Peuples de la Transcaucasie pendant la Guerre et devant la Paix* (Paris, Bossard, 1921), by P. G. La Chesnais, and of *La Révolution Russe et les Nouvelles Républiques Transcaucasiennes* (Paris, 1922), by J. L. Melicoff.

Professor Henri Grappin of the National School of Oriental Languages at Paris has written an *Histoire de la Pologne, des Origines à 1922* (Paris, Larousse, 1923, pp. 446).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Handelsman, *La Méthodologie de l'Histoire dans la Science Polonoise, XIV^e-XIX^e Siècles* (*Revue de Synthèse Historique*, XXXIV, 1); H. von Eckardt, *Russlands Auswärtige Politik 1917-1923* (*Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, April).

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

Eugene Darkó has edited a first volume of *Laonici Chalcocondylae Historiarum Demonstrationes* (Budapest, Hungarian Academy of Letters, 1922, pp. xxvi, 207). The text has been carefully revised and critically annotated, so that scholars will now have available in good form this important source for the history of the fall of the Byzantine Empire and the rise of the Ottoman Turks.

W. Miller has issued a new edition of his volume in the Cambridge Historical Series on the Balkan peninsula in the nineteenth century, with the title changed to *The Ottoman Empire and its Successors, 1801-1922* (Cambridge University Press, 1923, pp. xv, 595), with supplementary account of events since the original edition in 1913.

ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

The publication of the twelfth volume of Victor Chauvin's *Bibliographie des Ouvrages Arabes* (Liège, Vaillant-Carmanne, 1913-1922, pp. vi, 467), begun before the war, has at last been completed. The materials in this volume relate to the beginnings of Mohammedanism. The items listed are mainly from the lands of western Europe, and include publications from as early as the sixteenth century down to about 1912. The *Geschichte der Syrischen Literatur* (Bonn, Marcus and Weber, 1922, pp. xvi, 378), by Anton Baumstark, is an exhaustive presentation of the existing materials both manuscript and printed. It does not, however, replace the more brilliant characterization of Syrian literature in Duval's *Littérature Syriaque*.

Professor Auguste Foucher, of the Sorbonne, lately appointed first French minister to Afghanistan, has conducted negotiations with the Amir which have culminated in his obtaining for France the exclusive right of carrying on archaeological excavations in that country. The case is parallel to that of the French archaeological monopoly in Persia. It is understood that an archaeological explorer of the highest qualifications, belonging to another country, has already been refused admission to Afghanistan.

A forgotten episode in the early European voyages to India is carefully recounted by Franz Hümmerich in *Die Erste Deutsche Handelsfahrt nach Indien 1505-06, ein Unternehmen der Welser, Fugger, und andere Augsburger sowie Nürnberger Häuser* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1923, pp. vi, 151).

Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe has given a brief, sympathetic account of *Sir William Wedderburn and the Indian Reform Movement* (London, Allen and Unwin, 1923), based upon personal acquaintance.

Professor Henri Cordier, in the third volume of his *Mélanges d'Histoire et de Géographie Orientales* (Paris, Maisonneuve, 1923, pp. 368), includes various items on the history of Indo-China, especially in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. There is also an account of the mission to Canton in 1787 of the Chevalier d'Entrecasteaux.

An account of *Die Ländliche Besiedlung Westsibiriens durch Russland* (Jena, Fischer, 1923, pp. xv, 204) is by Hans Jürgen Seraphim.

An American observer, H. K. Norton, in *The Far Eastern Republic of Siberia* (London, Allen and Unwin, 1923), has presented a fairly good account of the establishment and history of this new state. The book reflects an anti-Japanese attitude, and is, on the whole, rather friendly to the new republic.

AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

Messieurs R. Cagnat, A. Merlin, and L. Chatelain have published under the auspices of the Institute of France a volume of *Inscriptions Latines d'Afrique: Tripolitaine, Tunisie, Maroc* (Paris, Leroux, 1923, pp. 230).

Germaine Rouillard has written a monograph on *L'Administration Civile de l'Egypte Byzantine* (Paris, Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1923, pp. xii, 244).

The publication of *Les Sources Inédites de l'Histoire du Maroc*, by Lieut.-Col. H. de Castries, has entered upon a second series devoted to the *Dynastie Filalienne*, of which a first volume has appeared (Paris, Leroux, 1923, pp. 714).

Le Général Laperrine, Grand Saharien (Paris, Plon, 1922, pp. 296), by J. Germain and S. Faye, is an account of the most important figure in the French activities in the western Sahara and its oases in the last score of years.

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

In the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the first volume of Dr. Stock's *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments respecting North America* is in large part in type, and the first volume of Dr. Hackett's *Historical Documents relating to New Mexico, Nueva Vizcaya, etc.* (Bandelier transcripts), will be printed within a few days. The completed manuscript of Mr. David M. Matteson's catalogue of American manuscripts in European libraries (in so far as these are represented in existing printed catalogues or similar bibliographical works) has been received. Professor Bassett's editing of the correspondence of Andrew Jackson is nearly completed. Progress has been made in the preparation of a Guide to the materials for American history in Scandinavian archives: namely, inventories of materials relating to diplomatic relations of the United States have been prepared by official aid, Professors Amandus Johnson and Waldemar Westergaard have kindly placed at the disposal of the Department their detailed notes respecting New Sweden and the Danish West Indies, and provision has been made by the American-Scandinavian Foundation whereby Mr. Gunnar J. Malmin of Luther College is preparing, under direction of the Department, that portion of the Guide which relates to archival papers concerning migration to the United States. From September 1 Professor Samuel F. Bemis of Whitman College occupies for a year the position of Research Fellow of the Carnegie Institution, engaged in Washington with researches in diplomatic history.

Among recent accessions in the Division of Manuscripts of the Library of Congress are a journal of a voyage from Spithead to Cape Breton and from Louisbourg to Newfoundland in 1745-1746, by J. H. Bastide; a diary kept on board H. M. S. *Kingston*, 1755-1760, by Gilbert Budd; thir-

teen letters to Congress from the King of France, 1778-1787, transferred from the Department of State; ten letters of or to Nathanael Greene, 1778-1783; miscellaneous papers of William Lenoir, 1821-1833, and two letter-books of Thomas H. Nelson, 1861-1865.

A series entitled *The History of Civilization in the United States*, in twelve volumes, is to be prepared under the general editorship of Professors A. M. Schlesinger, Dixon R. Fox, and Ashley H. Thorndike, with Carl Becker as consulting editor, and to be published by the Macmillan Company. The purpose of the work is to trace in progressive stages all the social, economic, intellectual, and cultural growth of the American people. The method will embrace both description and interpretation. The history is expected to be ready in 1926. The titles of the volumes will be approximately as follows: *The Neighbors of the English* (1492-1763), by H. I. Priestley; *The Planting of the Colonies* (1607-1690), by T. J. Wertenbaker; *Provincial Society* (1690-1763), by J. T. Adams; *The Development of the American People* (1763-1792), by C. W. Alvord; *The Completion of Independence* (1792-1830), by D. R. Fox; *The Rise of the Common Man* (1830-1850), by C. R. Fish; *The Welding of Nationality* (1850-1865), by A. C. Cole; *The Economic Revolution* (1865-1878), by Allan Nevins; *The Era of Big Business* (1878-1898), by Miss Ida Tarbell; *The Intellectual Awakening* (1878-1898), by A. M. Schlesinger; *The Quest for Social Justice* (1878-1914), by H. E. Barnes; and *Contemporary America* (1914-1926).

Upon suggestion by a committee of the American Historical Association the Secretary of State has instructed the editor of publications in his department, Dr. Gaillard Hunt, to prepare for publication in a series of volumes the whole body of instructions sent by the Secretaries of State to American diplomatic representatives abroad, from 1789 down to a recent period.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has in press a volume on *Arbitration Treaties among the American Nations*, prepared by Dr. William R. Manning of the Department of State. He has also completed the manuscript of a collection of documents from the archives of that department, to compose three volumes, entitled probably, *United States Diplomatic Correspondence concerning Latin-American Independence*, and extending from about 1810 to 1830.

Slavery and its Results, by Alfred H. Benners, is from the press of the J. W. Burke Company, Macon, Georgia.

The General Land Office: its History, Activities, and Organization, by Milton Conover, is no. 13 of the *Service Monographs of the United States Government* (Johns Hopkins University Press).

The thirty-seventh *Annual Report* of the Bureau of Ethnology, being the report for 1915-1916, but just published, is devoted to the Winnebago tribe. Of this monograph of 560 pages, by Mr. Paul Radin, some 50 are devoted to the history and archaeology of the tribe.

Dr. George B. Grinnell, long familiar with the Cheyenne tribe, publishes this autumn through the Yale University Press two volumes on *The Cheyenne Indians: their History and Ways of Life*.

The American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia (715 Spruce Street) has announced a prize of \$100, given by the Most Rev. Archbishop Messmer of Milwaukee, for the best historical essay on the subject "Catholic Missionary Work among the Colored People of the United States, 1776-1866". Particulars may be learned from the secretary of the society.

The March number of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* includes the following articles: Father Oswald Moosmueller, the Pioneer Benedictine Historian of the United States, by Rev. Felix Fellner, O. S. B.; the Rev. George Strobel, 1800-1874, by Ella M. E. Flick; and the Work of the Sisters of Mercy in the United States, Archdiocese of Baltimore, 1852-1921, by Sister Mary Eulalia Herron.

Specially written for readers in Italy, but important also to Americans, is Alfredo Bosi's *Cinquant' Anni di Vita Italiana in America* (New York, Bagnasco Press, pp. 530).

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

John Long's Voyages and Travels in the Years 1768-1788, edited by Milo M. Quaife, has been brought out in Chicago by the firm of Donnelley.

The Yale University Press expects to publish this autumn a volume on *British Colonial Policy in the American Revolution*, by Professor Charles M. Andrews.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has published in three volumes the whole series of *Prize Cases decided in the United States Supreme Court, 1789-1918* (Oxford University Press, pp. xxxii, 2182), including also cases on the instance side in which questions of prize law were involved, the whole prepared under the supervision of Dr. James Brown Scott.

Volume XIV., part II., of the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* is devoted to an account of French Newspapers in the United States before 1800, by Messrs. A. H. Shearer, G. P. Winship, and William Beer, chiefly by Mr. Winship, treating in full detail the story of these very rare publications of Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Charleston, and New Orleans.

Dr. Dunbar Rowland's ten volumes of the letters, papers, and speeches of Jefferson Davis are now ready for distribution, and can be obtained from the historical department of the state of Mississippi.

The Naval Records and Library Office (Navy Department) has issued a pamphlet on *American Ship Casualties of the World War*, including naval vessels, merchant ships, sailing vessels, and fishing craft, compiled by the Historical Section (pp. iii, 24).

Former members of the American diplomatic courier service which operated among various embassies of Europe in 1918 and 1919 have organized an association and designated Milton Conover of the New York University faculty to write their hitherto unrevealed history.

LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

The Maine Historical Society has recently acquired the original records of Scarborough, 1686-1816, by deposit from the town. The museum of the society and its collections of portraits have been rearranged. The annual meeting, which since 1822 has been held at Bowdoin College, was this year held in the library building in Portland.

The Lewiston Journal Company, Lewiston, Maine, has brought out *The Letters of John Fairfield*, member of Congress 1835-1837, United States senator 1843-1847, and governor of Maine during most of the intervening period. The volume is edited by Arthur B. Staples, and gives a valuable and entertaining picture of Washington life in its period.

The Massachusetts legislature in its last session provided for a special commission to collect materials for a history of Massachusetts in the World War and to supervise its compilation. They have appointed Major Eben Putnam as official historian in this field and secretary of the commission. Major Putnam is also preparing, for issue in 1924, a biography of Frederic Ward Putnam, naturalist and anthropologist, compiled from diaries, correspondence, and other papers.

The February-April *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society contains a body of notes on President Jackson's first visit to New England, in June, 1833, by Professor John S. Bassett.

In a paper printed in advance from vol. XXV. of the *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, Clifford B. Clapp traces the origin of the Harvard motto "Christo et Ecclesiae" to the Academy of Franeker and the influence of Dr. William Ames.

A Municipal History of Essex County in Massachusetts, in four volumes, edited by Benjamin F. Arrington, bears the imprint of the Lewis Historical Publishing Company.

The Connecticut Historical Society has acquired through the generosity of the Misses Beach of West Hartford and Mr. Morgan B. Brainard, president of the society, a collection (about 500 in number) of original manuscript muster, pay, and receipt rolls of Connecticut militia who served in the War of 1812; also, by gift of the late George E. Hoadley, a large collection of colonial, Continental, and state bills, together with some Confederate bills.

An elaborate and handsomely illustrated volume on *Old Houses of Connecticut*, prepared by Bertha C. Trowbridge, chairman of a committee

of the Connecticut Society of the Colonial Dames of America, will soon be published by the Yale University Press.

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The New York legislature has placed at the disposal of the New York State Historical Association the sum of \$5000 to be used in preparing a survey and report for the appropriate celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the important events in that state's Revolutionary history, and particularly for commemorating in 1927 the battles of Oriskany, Bennington, and Saratoga. The society proposes to celebrate each event on its anniversary in the particular locality, to erect appropriate markers and memorials, and, among other plans, to publish a series of historical volumes, under state or local auspices, to treat of the part played by New York in the history of the nation.

The University of the State of New York has published the *Minutes of the Court of Rensselaerwyck, 1648-1652* (pp. 236), edited by the state archivist, Mr. A. J. F. van Laer. The original manuscript is in the state archives, having survived the fire of 1911, though much damaged. Earlier records of the court of the Rensselaer colony are not preserved. Those now made accessible to scholars extend from the arrival of Brant van Slichtenhorst as director until the erection of a separate court for Fort Orange, which reduced the earlier court to slight importance. The minutes now presented cover all the concerns of a small community, are of much historical interest, and are edited with great perfection of workmanship.

The July issue of the *New York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin* contains the second part of William L. Calver's account of the British Army Button in the American Revolution, and an index (of places and events) to the catalogue of American Revolutionary Diaries prepared by Dr. William S. Thomas.

The History of the New York Public Library, by Harry M. Lydenberg, chief reference librarian, which has been running in the *Bulletin* of that institution, has now been put into the form of a handsome illustrated volume of 643 pages, published by the library. All matters of the growth of the three great collections, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden, of their consolidation, of the subsequent growth and activities of the library, and of the creation of its building, are most carefully treated. The index occupies 100 pages of the book.

Among the articles which appear in the July number of the *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society* are: Old Houses of Elizabethtown; the Governor Belcher Mansion, by Warren R. Dix; Some New Jersey Side-Lights on Revolutionary Days, by Rev. Charles B. Bullard; James Parker, the Printer of Woodbridge, by William H. Benedict; the Minisink Indian Trail, by Professor Charles F. Philhower; and a For-

gotten Elizabethtown Newspaper, the *Essex Patriot*, by Elmer T. Hutchinson.

The Pennsylvania State Library has recently acquired a manuscript of 38 pages consisting of the original surveys of the lands on the western side of Delaware River, dating from May 27, 1675, to Apr. 16, 1876, and signed by Waldo Wharton, appointed surveyor-general by Governor Lovelace of New York.

The contents of the July number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* include an article on Batso and the Bloomaries, by Carmita De S. Jones; one on Springs and Spas of Old-Time Philadelphians, by F. H. Shelton; and one on the Story of the Pennsylvania-Delaware Circular Boundary, by J. Carroll Hayes.

Willing Letters and Papers, edited, with a biographical essay on Thomas Willing of Philadelphia (1731-1821), by Thomas Willing Balch, is from the press of Allen, Lane, and Scott.

Womelsdorf is in Berks County, Pa., in the Lebanon Valley, between Reading and Lebanon, with Tulpehocken Creek near at hand. In commemoration of the bicentennial of the first settlement of a colony in the Tulpehocken Valley Rev. Dr. P. C. Croll has prepared a book (pp. 150), reprinted from articles in the *Reading Eagle*, entitled *Annals of Womelsdorf, Pa., and the Tulpehocken Community*, in which a large amount of local history is recorded, from the Palatine settlement down. Baron Stiegel, Conrad Weiser, and many other names of builders of America appear.

Among the *Papers* read before the Lancaster Historical Society May 4 are some extracts from Moravian diaries at Bethlehem relating to Lancaster, 1768-1786; some items from letters, 1774-1780; and some notes relative to Revolutionary pensioners living in Lancaster in 1840. In the issue for June 1 is a paper by H. C. Martin on Federal Revenue of Lancaster County from about 1850 to date.

Articles in the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* are: the Monongahela River, by James M. Norris; the Land Policy and System of the Penn Family in Early Pennsylvania, by Allan C. Gregg; Squatters and Titles to Land in Early Western Pennsylvania, by James M. Fullerton; Early Western Pennsylvania Agriculture, by W. Y. Hayward; and two letters of James Nevin, 1825, relating to early transportation in Pennsylvania.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The principal content of the *Southern Historical Society Papers*, new series, no. VI. (June, 1923), is an installment (Feb. 18-Mar. 25, 1862) of the proceedings of the first Confederate Congress, first session. The proceedings as here published contain extensive abstracts of debates as well as other facts not found in the published *Journal*. The material has

been compiled from newspapers, principally from the Richmond *Examiner*, and will be continued. This number of the *Papers* includes also an article by Margaret B. S. Robinson entitled My Childhood Recollections of the War; an address by A. B. Chandler on Matthew F. Maury; a statement by George L. Christian concerning General Lee's Headquarters Papers and Records; and some letters to General Harry Heth from General Lee, President Davis, the Comte de Paris, General Early, and General Longstreet.

The principal contents of the June number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, aside from continued articles, are an account of Fort Frederick, by W. McCulloh Brown, and a discussion, by Louis D. Scisco, of Colonel Henry Norwood's *A Voyage to Virginia in 1649*.

Paper Money in Maryland, 1727-1789, by Kathryn L. Behrens, is a recent number of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies*.

The issue of the *Bulletin* of the Virginia State Library for October, 1921 (Richmond, 1923), is an *Index to Obituary Notices* in the Richmond *Enquirer* from May 9, 1804, through 1828, and the Richmond *Whig* from January, 1824, through 1838. It is announced that, for lack of funds, the *Bulletin* will be discontinued as a quarterly publication, although occasional numbers may be issued from time to time.

In the July number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* are found a number of interesting letters (1807, 1808) from Mrs. Elizabeth Beverley Kennon, widow of General Richard Kennon, and her daughter, Sally Skipwith Kennon, afterwards wife of Commodore Arthur Sinclair, to members of the Mordecai family of Warrenton, North Carolina. Mr. Charles E. Kemper contributes to the same number some further notes pertaining to the Valley of Virginia.

In the July number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* is a discussion, by W. W. Scott, of the "Knights of the Horseshoe", specifically of the route of Governor Spotswood's Tramontane expedition (1716). Touching this expedition, there is a note by Charles E. Kemper concerning Spotswood's mileage accounts, which appeared in the January number of the *Quarterly*. Mr. Fairfax Harrison contributes some extracts from the Council Journal, 1714, 1716, bearing upon the westward movement in Virginia, and there is a letter of 1856 from Richard Randolph to Hugh Blair Grigsby.

William Attmore's *Journal of a Tour to North Carolina*, edited by Lida T. Rodman, appears among the *James Sprunt Historical Publications* (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina).

An *Index to Volumes I. to XX. of the North Carolina Booklet* (1901-1921), compiled by Grace Stowell, has been brought out in Greensboro by the North Carolina College for Women.

The second publication of the Florida State Historical Society will be a body of *Notes on the Life and Works of Bernard Romans*, with a fac-

simile of his map of Florida, 1774. That map is basic in character. The text is by Mr. P. Lee Phillips, chief of the Division of Maps in the Library of Congress. The third publication will be an English translation of the *Memorial of Solis de Meras*, concerning the career of his brother-in-law Pedro Menéndez de Avilés. The Spanish text was printed by Ruidiaz; it is now translated and edited by Mrs. Jeanette Thurber Connor. Other volumes which are in preparation are a history of Florida since 1821, by the late Caroline M. Brevard, edited by Dr. J. A. Robertson; a volume giving in Spanish and English the *cedulario* of the King of Spain referring to Florida, 1580-1604, edited by Mr. John B. Stetson, jr.; a volume of the petitions of the Loyalists in Florida for indemnification because of losses suffered by leaving East Florida in 1784, by Professor Wilbur H. Siebert; a volume giving in Spanish and English *Tristan de Luna y Arellano's account of an expedition to West Florida in 1558*, and several volumes of colonial records of Spanish Florida, consisting of selected papers of governors and other secular persons, edited by Mrs. Connor.

The October (1922) number of the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* contains an article by Henry E. Chambers on the Early Commercial Prestige of New Orleans; one by Henry P. Dart entitled a Gentleman of Pointe Coupee (Philip Haineaux, or Haynault, or Haynaud), including will (1743) and inventory; an account, by W. O. Hart and Dr. Y. R. LeMonnier, of the Confederate Die for the Coinage of Silver Half Dollars; the report of the committee of the Louisiana senate (1843) upon the question of the fine imposed on Andrew Jackson by Judge A. D. Hall (1815), reprinted from a rare pamphlet; and a continuation of the Superior Council records (1737-1739).

WESTERN STATES

The June number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* contains an article by Solon J. Buck on the Progress and Possibilities of Mississippi Valley History; one by William F. Raney on Recruiting and Crimping in Canada for the Northern Forces, 1861-1865; and one by E. E. Dale on the Ranchman's Last Frontier. In the section of Notes and Documents is an illustrative characterization, by Newton D. Mereness, of the Historical Material in Washington of Value to the (individual) State, and an account, by Waldo G. Leland, of the Lesueur Collection of American Sketches in the Museum of Natural History at Havre.

The general assembly of Ohio has appropriated \$238,000 for the erection of an addition to the present home of the Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society as a World War Memorial.

The April number of the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* contains a paper by Dr. Edwin E. Sparks on Inter-State Migration and the Making of the Union; one by Dr. Howard Jones on Logan and the Logan Elm; and an account, by Lucy E. Keeler, of the Centenary Celebration of the Birth of Rutherford Birchard Hayes, at Spiegel Grove,

Fremont, Ohio (Oct. 4, 1922). The July number includes: Explorations of the Campbell Island Village Site and the Hine Mound and Village Site, by H. C. Shetrone; the Struggle for Statehood in Ohio, by Ruhl J. Bartlett; and some papers read at the St. Clair celebration, Nov. 6, 1922, among them the Story of Fort St. Clair, by Ralph B. Ehler.

Vol. II. of the *Governors' Messages and Letters*, published by the Indiana Historical Commission (pp. xxxix, 772) and edited by Professor Logan Esarey, runs from the beginning of 1812 to the end of 1816. Messages and letters of Acting Governor John Gibson, 1812-1813, and of Governor Thomas Posey, 1813 to 1816, occupy a portion of the volume, but in the main it consists of papers and correspondence of William Henry Harrison, herewith concluded. The documents are presented with little annotation, except in the first quarter of the volume, but they are a mine of information for the student of the War of 1812 in its western aspects and for the history of the territory of Indiana. The commission has also published, in separate volumes, *A Sergeant's Diary*, a daily diary kept by Elmer A. Straub of Indianapolis, who served in the 150th Field Artillery, and *The War Purse of Indiana; the Five Liberty Loans and War Savings and Thrift Campaigns in Indiana during the World War* (pp. 278).

In the June number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* are found, besides a continuation of Adam A. Leonard's study of Personal Politics in Indiana, 1816-1840, an account, by William C. Thompson, of Eleutherian College, "a unique step in the educational history of Indiana"; a paper by Lee Burns on the Ohio River and its Influence on the Development of Indiana; one by Alma W. Wilson entitled a Pioneer Engineer (Lazarus B. Wilson); and one by Elizabeth S. Denehie on the Harmonist Movement in Indiana.

In the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, April-July, 1922, Professor James A. Woodburn offers a highly interesting paper on the Promotion of Historical Study in America, following the Civil War. Other contributions to this issue are In the Ranks of Shiloh, the reminiscences of Leander Stillwell, reprinted from the *New York Tribune*; an account of Springfield Society before the Civil War, by Caroline O. Brown; and an address by Amos Miller delivered at the diamond jubilee of Carthage College. Among the documents published are some letters describing conditions in the Illinois country in 1842; some Civil War letters, 1863; and a circular letter by Gov. Ninian Edwards in relation to his candidacy for the United States Senate.

The June-July issue of the *Chicago Historical Society Bulletin* contains a letter concerning Chicago and its vicinity in 1837, written by Bernsby Huntoon to his parents in New Hampshire; and another written by James Mulvey in 1854.

Among the articles which appear in the issue of the *Tennessee Historical Magazine* for July, 1921 (issued in May, 1923), are: Co-operation

between State Universities and State Historical Societies, by Dr. Joseph Schafer of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin; the Battle of Spring Hill, by Thomas R. Hay; an account of some Old Blount County Papers, by W. E. Parham; Happenings in the White Haven Community, Shelby County, Tennessee, Fifty or more Years ago, by Judge J. P. Young; Old Fort Loudon, the First English Settlement in what is now the State of Tennessee, and the Fort Loudon Massacre, by Hon. Thomas H. Cooke; and the concluding installment of the Battle of King's Mountain as seen by British Officers, by Hon. Samuel C. Williams. The October (1921) number (issued in August, 1923) contains a history of St. John's Church, Maury County, Tennessee, from the pen of George W. Polk; a sketch of William Tatham, Wautaugan, by Samuel C. Williams; a history of the Thirteenth Tennessee Regiment, Confederate, by the late Rev. James D. West, with a biographical sketch of the author by his daughter, Miss Elizabeth H. West, state librarian of Texas; and a first installment of a study, by Dr. Albert C. Holt, of the Economic and Social Beginnings of Tennessee.

By authority of the board of supervisors for the county of Wayne the authorities of the Burton Historical Collection, Detroit, have published a small pamphlet entitled *Documents relating to the Erection of Wayne County and Michigan Territory*.

By legislative act of the state of Wisconsin the existence of the Wisconsin War History Commission ends and its records, manuscripts, and historical materials are turned over to the State Historical Society. An appropriation of \$5000 per annum is provided, and the society is charged with the collecting, preserving, cataloguing, and editing of materials relating to the activities and services of all persons in the state who served in the World War.

Among the articles in the June number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* are: a Polish Pioneer's Story, by Mrs. William F. Allen; the third of Dr. Joseph Schafer's papers on the Yankee and the Teuton in Wisconsin, in which are discussed Some Social Traits of the Yankees; and a sketch of John Coumbe, the first white settler in Richland County, by Camille Coumbe. In the section devoted to documents is found the speech delivered in the Wisconsin senate on March 1 of this year by Senator John E. Cashman in behalf of the "pure history" bill, of which he was the author. There follows, in the section of editorial comment, an eminently wise and judicious, as well as searching, discussion of the question of popular censorship of history texts and, in particular, of the possible and probable results of the Wisconsin law.

The Minnesota War Records Commission, which was organized for the collecting and publication of records of Minnesota action in the World War, has taken over the work of a defunct commission established in 1903 for the publication of a history of the action of the state and its citizens

in the war with Spain. The commission now publishes *Minnesota in the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection* (pp. xiv, 675), by Franklin F. Holbrook, its secretary, of which the first 133 pages offer a good history of Minnesota action in that war, of the four regiments of Minnesota infantry that served in the war, of Minnesotans in other branches of the service, and of activities and events at home during the warfare. The remaining 500-odd pages are occupied with a roster of Minnesotans in the service of the United States from April 21, 1898, to July 4, 1902. The further work of the commission, relating to the World War, is expected to result in eight more volumes, three containing the names and brief statements of the service of all Minnesota soldiers, sailors, and marines, three of historical narratives, a special volume on a Minnesota regiment of field artillery, and one volume summarizing the whole story in form suitable for general distribution.

The issue of the *Minnesota History Bulletin* bearing the date February—May, 1922 (double number), contains an article by Professor Orin G. Libby on Some Aspects of Mid-West America; one by Professor Clarence W. Alvord on Mississippi Valley Problems and the American Revolution; and one by Calvin L. Brown on Some Changes in Local Boundaries and Names in Minnesota. The August number has for its chief contents an article on Official Encouragement of Immigration to Minnesota during the Territorial Period, by Livia Appel and Theodore C. Blegen.

Articles in the July number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* are: Congregational Life in Muscatine, 1843–1893, by Irving B. Richman; the Economic Basis of the Populist Movement in Iowa, by Herman C. Nixon; the Development of Trans-Mississippi Political Geography, by Ruth L. Higgins; and a Document relating to Dutch Immigration to Iowa in 1846, contributed, with an introduction, by Henry S. Lucas.

The principal article in the October (1922) number of the *Annals of Iowa* is an Overland Journey to California by Platte River Route and South Pass in 1850, by Fancher Stimson (1828–1902). There is a briefer article, by Mrs. Sarah W. Nossaman, on Pioneering at Bonaparte and near Pella.

The July number of the *Palimpsest* contains an article on Father Marquette, by Ruth B. Middaugh, and one on Louis Joliet, by John Ely Briggs.

Under an appropriation from the general assembly of the state of Missouri to the State Historical Society, the society has published three volumes (pp. 526, 528, 542) of *The Messages and Proclamations of the Governors of the State of Missouri*, compiled and edited by Mr. Floyd C. Shoemaker, secretary of the society, and Miss Buel Leopard of its staff. The volumes include inaugural addresses, annual and biennial messages, messages communicated at the opening of special sessions, veto messages, special messages, proclamations, and certain memoranda, of sixteen governors, covering the period from 1820 to 1864. Adequate biographical

sketches of each governor are prefixed. There is no index, but it may be presumed that one will be included in the last volume of the series, which it is to be hoped may be continued to a later date.

By bequest of the late Mrs. Julia Clark Voorhis of New York, the Missouri Historical Society of St. Louis has received an extraordinary collection of manuscripts, probably a thousand in number, ranging from 1766 to 1848, of which about 350 relate to George Rogers Clark, while others concern the Lewis and Clark expedition, embracing the original journals; also many papers pertaining to William Clark as governor of Missouri territory, brigadier-general of militia, and superintendent of Indian affairs.

The April number of the *Missouri Historical Review* contains the first of a series of articles by Hildegard R. Herklotz on the Jayhawkers in Missouri, 1858-1863; likewise the first of a series by Walter B. Stevens on the New Journalism in Missouri; and continuations of several papers hitherto mentioned.

The Walter Ridgway Publishing Company of Columbia, Missouri, brings out, as a book for high schools and the general public, *Missouri and Missourians* (pp. 345, illustrated), by Floyd C. Shoemaker, secretary of the Missouri State Historical Society.

The Bank of the State of Missouri, by John R. Cable, appears among the Columbia University Studies.

Under the auspices of the Missouri state board of agriculture Mr. John Ashton has prepared with much industry and intelligence a useful contribution to the knowledge of one important aspect of Missouri agriculture, *A History of Hogs and Pork Products in Missouri* (pp. 74).

The July number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* contains a paper by J. Fred Rippy on the Negotiation of the Gadsden Treaty, the third installment of the Memoirs of Major George B. Erath, edited by Lucy A. Erath, and the eighth of the Bryan-Hayes Correspondence, edited by E. W. Winkler.

In 1921 the Texas Historical Society, which had been inactive for a number of years, made the Rosenberg Library of Galveston the custodian of its manuscript collections. An examination of these by Mr. John M. Winterbotham of Galveston has brought to light very numerous documents of pronounced historical value; and a large selection, with elaborate biographical and explanatory notes by Mr. Winterbotham, has been placed on exhibit in the Rosenberg Library. The main groups are manuscript and printed letters and decrees of Mexican officials before the Texan Revolution; the James Morgan papers, including many letters from Samuel Swartwout; the Peter Wagner Grayson papers; those of Samuel M. Williams; and those of the Truehart family. The material appears to be copious on empresarios and early settlers, friction and war with Mexico, and the politics and commerce of many periods.

Articles in the July number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly*, aside from continuations, are: the Introduction of Cattle into the Pacific Northwest, by C. S. Kingston; Captain John Mullan and the Engineers' Problem, by Samuel F. Bemis; and the Mullan Road: its Local History and Significance, by T. C. Elliott.

The June number of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* contains an article by Ralph S. Kuykendall on a Northwest Trader in the Hawaiian Islands (William Brown); some Letters relating to the Second Voyage of the *Columbia*, edited by Judge F. W. Howay; and the second installment of the Diary of Rev. George H. Gary (with introduction and notes by Charles H. Carey).

CANADA

The Literary and Historical Society of Quebec has issued an *Index* to its archival publications, the items of which are made to correspond exactly with the entries in the card index of the Quebec Provincial Archives. Appended to the Index is a list of documents now belonging to the society.

Seraphin Marion has collected a considerable number of accounts in *Relations des Voyageurs Français en Nouvelle France au XVII^e Siècle* (Paris, Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1923, pp. vii, 276).

The Story of the Canadian Pacific Railway (pp. 122), by Keith Morris, is published in London by William Stevens.

Mid Snow and Ice: the Apostles of the Northwest, by Rev. P. Duchaussois, O.M.I. (London, Burns, Oates, and Washbourne), is an illustrated account of the life and labors of the Oblate missionaries of Mary Immaculate in the northwest of Canada.

AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

A general review of publications on Latin America during the ten years just prior to 1914 was presented in the January–February number of the *Revue Historique*.

Tortola: a Quaker Experiment of Long Ago in the Tropics, by Charles F. Jenkins (London, Friends' Bookshop, pp. 106), gives with documents the history of a Friends' settlement and meeting which continued for some forty-five years in the middle of the eighteenth century on this small West Indian island.

Father C. Bayle of the Society of Jesus is the author of a brief biography of *Vasco Nuñez de Balboa* (Madrid, Razón y Fe, 1922, pp. 110).

The Art History of Ancient Peru, by Dr. Walter Lehmann and Dr. Heinrich Döring, including some 130 color and collotype plates, is the first publication of the research department of the Berlin Ethnographical Museum.

The *Boletín de la Academia Nacional de la Historia* of Venezuela, for October, 1922, no. 20, is remarkable for a large contribution to the history of Marshal Antonio José de Sucre, the victor of Ayacucho, and first president of Bolivia. There is a genealogy of his family, showing his descent from a noble family in the Spanish and Austrian Netherlands, a number of documents respecting his military services, and nearly a hundred of his letters, chiefly to General Santa Cruz and General Andrade. The bulletin also contains a catalogue of 200 pamphlets of the revolutionary period belonging to the academy, and a continuation of the proceedings of the first Congress of Venezuela, in November, 1811.

The *Jornal do Commercio* of Rio de Janeiro, the oldest newspaper in South America, founded in 1827, has just published a volume of 472 pages commemorating the centenary of Brazilian independence. It contains a large amount of valuable information, from the files of the journal itself and a few earlier Brazilian newspapers, covering practically every phase of Brazilian history—political, economic, musical, literary, educational—from 1822 to 1891, with much statistical and biographical material for the history of the empire. The title is *Edição Commemorativa do Primeiro Centenário da Independência do Brasil*.

The centennial of Brazilian independence is to be further marked by the issue of a *Diccionario e Encyclopedias Historico, Geologico, e Ethnographico do Brasil*, in five volumes, of a thousand pages each, with many maps.

The Instituto de Investigaciones Historicas connected with the University of Buenos Aires, under the energetic conduct of Señor Emilio Ravignani, expects before long to issue three more volumes (XV., XVI., XVII.) of its *Documentos para la Historia Argentina*; they will be concerned with the Liga del Litoral and other matters of the mutual relations of the provinces. There will also soon be a volume of documents illustrating the history of education during the colonial period, and a volume cataloguing the section "Contaduría y Hacienda" of the Archivo General of the nation and the archives of the city of Buenos Aires. The institute has begun the publication of a periodical *Boletín*, containing notes on the results of investigations which are going forward, reviews of books, notes of articles in periodicals, and similar pieces of historical information. The Instituto has also inaugurated a series called *Biblioteca Argentina de Libros Raros Americanos* by issuing, with an introduction by Señor D. L. Molinari, a facsimile reprint of Lic. Antonio de León's *Tratado de las Confirmaciones Reales de Encomiendas, Oficios, etc.* (Madrid, 1630), a standard treatise on the law respecting encomiendas, etc., in the New World, by one who had been an official of the Council of the Indies and judge in the Casa de Contratación.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Arthur, *Coast Forts in Colonial New Hampshire* (*Coast Artillery Journal*, June); H. M. Chapin, *New*

England Vessels in the Expedition against Louisbourg, 1745 (New England Historical and Genealogical Register, January, April); H. E. Barnes, *The Evolution of American Criminal Jurisprudence as illustrated by the Criminal Code of Pennsylvania* (Open Court, June); W. C. Langdon, *The Early Corporate Development of the Telephone* (Bell Telephone Quarterly, July); C. C. Masó, *La Habana en el Siglo XVI*, I. (Cuba Contemporánea, June); C. Leonhardt, *Acción Educadora de los Jesuitas Españoles en los Paises que formaron el Virreinato del Río de la Plata* (Estudios, January-April); E. Ravignani, *El Tratado con la Gran Bretaña, de 1825, y la Libertad de Cultos* (Boletín del Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, I, 7-8).

